

The Examiner Examined:
BEING A
VINDICATION
OF THE
HISTORY
OF
LITURGIES.

By T. C. D. D.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Robert Clavell*, at the *Peacock* at the
West-end of *S. Pauls*, 1691.

Imprimatur,

Jan 29 1697.

C. Alston, R. P. D. HEN.
Episc. Lond. à Sacris.

The Examiner Examined.

C H A P. I.

Of the Title and Preface.

S. 1. **A**FTER my Second Part of the *History of Liturgies* had been Public near Six Months, comes out *An Examination of Dr. C's Scholaistical History of Liturgies*, by S. B. Which Title was designed, to make the Book look like and pass for an Answer to both Parts, which consist of 600 Pages; whereas the *Examination* reaches no further than to 76 Pages of the First Part, and in that compass, 23 whole Pages, and a great part of 10 more, pass Unexamined; so that there is an odd Synecdoche in this General Title. I will not enquire whether Mr. S. B. be so Eminent, that all Men know him by that Cypher, or so obscure, that he may be concealed under those two Letters: Only I wish, when he design'd to garnish his Title-page with *Causabon's* Sense of *Anisupia*, he had not fixed upon his account of the remote and general meaning of that word, and purposely omitted the only sense of that word which is proper to our Question, which he might have found in the same Page of *Causabon*, That Liturgy signifies a description of the Order for celebrating Divine Offices, as in the Liturgies of Peter and James. *Exercit. pag. 384.*

S. 2. If the Preface were writ by Mr. S. B. it was politicly done to give us his own Character under another Name; if it were writ by the Publisher, 'tis strange that his Friend, who tells us, *His Sayings, his Judgement, his Wishes, yea, his very Thoughts*; should so hastily put out this inconsiderable part of the Controversie without the Authors knowledge. But his Zeal

to serve a Party in a Critical Juncture, and the rare Character he gives of Mr.S.B. will expiate for that seeming Rudeness. He tells us, Mr.S.B. *is a Conformist*; and it is well the Preface saith so, otherwise nothing in the Book discovers it; probably he is one of those Mr.Clarkson calls, *Prudential Conformists*; who comply to avoid the Lash of the Law, but care no more for the Liturgy, than the Philosophers of old did for the Vulgars Notions about the Gods. Disc. of Lit.pag.19. But the Preface saith, He *Conforms upon Principles he thinks he can justify*. It seems he can Dispute probably of all sides, for he justifies Nonconformity in this Tract. 'Tis said, *He uses the Liturgy as fully as the Law requires in his public Administrations*; I wonder how he can justify that, since his Book declares, he thinks he can pray better by his own Expressions, and there is a Curse upon the Deceiver, *who hath in his Flock a Male, yet offereth to the Lord a corrupt thing*, Malach.I.14. He hath tied himself up to an invariable use of the Common-Prayer, yet counts them, not only Pious, but Judicious, who will not be so tied up; therefore he must now doubt the piety and the prudence of his Subscription. I perceive he *joyns with Dissenters in their public Worship*: And I would gladly know, how many of them this open allowance of their way, hath brought over to joyn with him in the Liturgy. He accounts the Established Church, *a Party, and is not wedded to it neither*: Probably he gave Her his Hand against his Will, and thinks the Contract null *ab initio*. He thinks there *is something to be rectified in every Party*; but in this Book he finds no faults with one Party, and complains of none but the Churches Friends. It is not he alone, but all Men think, *that which is good in every Party, should be approved; and what is not so, laid aside, or amended*. But who must be the indifferent Judge over all Parties? Mr. S. B. (whatever his Friend thinks) will never be chosen to this Office: The real Conformists will not like a man who writes against Liturgies; and the Dissenters will never trust one that reads Common-Prayer. 'Tis pretended, *He is sorry to see such an aversion to the general Union of Protestants, and that old Animosities are awakened*: Yet he widens the Breach, by increasing the Dissenters ill Opinion of all prescribed Forms, which no well ordered Church can want; and he defends Mr.Clarkson's Book,

Book, which first awakned this Controversie after it had slept for many years. Perhaps, in his Opinion, none prejudiced the Church of England so much, as those who seem most zealous for Her: But others see, she is far more prejudiced by such as are so indifferent what become of Her, that they expose her Constitutions; and while they enjoy her Revenues, combine with those that are for removing her very Foundations. He that states Matters so falsely, is no fit Judge how others state their Questions; and I shall neither value the Censures or Reflections of one so manifestly partial, that he never speaks ill of the Dissenters, nor well of the Church. He told the Prefacer (it seems) his Thoughts, *That in a History of Liturgies, notice should have been taken of the various use of the Words, and the time it came first to be used in the strict Modern sense, as Mr. Cl. hath rightly done.* This aims at me, whom he supposes to have omitted this; but I spent Five Pages together, from pag. 121 — to pag. 125. (Part I.) in considering the use of *Liturgy*, and shewing, Mr. Clarkson had stated the time of its being taken in the Modern sense, very falsely. Now, if he read my First Book over, why doth he not confute this? If he never read so far, Solomon will tell him, *He that answereth a Matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame to him,* Prov. XVIII. 13. However, Mr. S. B. conceives, this is not the signification of a Liturgy, as used and enjoyed by the Church of England. Right! for no Man ever said, that [*Liturgy*,] without some Epithet, signified, a *Liturgy enjoyed by this or that Church*: But it hath from some of the earliest Ages, signified a *Public Form of Prayer*, and we have now such an one enjoyed. But he thinks (that's proof enough) instead of proving the Antiquity of *Liturgies in that Sense*, we should rectifie the Mistakes that have arisen concerning a *Liturgy, as used and enjoyed in our Church*. He forgets, that Mr. Cl. was the first who gave occasion to prove their Antiquity, and the first who questioned it; *Smeckynnuus*, and all that Party formerly, owned them to be 1300 year old; and must we let so new, so false, and so singular an Opinion pass without controul? As to *rectifying Mistakes*, Mr. Cl. and Mr. S. B. do not charge the Dissenters with any, both of them justify their way; so that it seems the Church alone is mistaken either in using or enjoying her Liturgy, and they would have her give it

it up for their sakes, who would never make one step towards her for the sake of Peace. But Men so wofully mistaken as Mr. Cl. and Mr. S. B. are very unfit to rectifie the practice of this and all other regular Churches, since they cannot make out any mistake in this Matter. The mistakes lie on the Dissenters side, which also had been long since removed; if their own Pastors, and some of ours, had not flattered and supported them in their Errors. That false representation of the state of the Question, with which the Preface concludes, must be charged upon Mr. S. B. who misled his Friend, and therefore it shall be considered in the Discourse. I have now done with the Armour-bearer, and proceed to the Champion, who fights against that side under which 'tis said) he takes double Pay.

C H A P. II.

Of the grounds for Liturgies in Scripture.

S. 1. Pag. 1. **M**After S. B. begins with an assurance, *He hath read my Book,* and a promise, *that he will forbear Reflections.* I have given a Reason already why I doubt the First, and his whole Book confutes the Second; for it abounds with Reflections, not only on my Cause, but on my Person, my Office, my Qualifications, &c. but they are so groundless, I can easily forgive them.

Pag. 2. But I cannot excuse him for telling his Prefacer and the World, that I undertook to prove *Liturgies* were only and invariably used in the first Three Centuries. For this was not needful for me to undertake, either to Answer Mr. Cl. who gave me the liberty of the first Five, or Six Centuries to prove this: Or to carry on my main design, which was (as I declared in my Introduction) *to collect in every Century such Testimonies of the Original, Use, and Antiquity of Liturgies, as the Argument needed.* Now every proof of a Form frequently or constantly used in the Three first Centuries, the Ages of Inspiration, before the Church was settled, tends to illustrate the History of *Liturgies*, which began first by the voluntary use of Forms, and
by

by degrees, as the Church drew nearer to a Settlement, to the constant and invariable use of many Forms, even to the use of a whole Liturgy, before these Three Centuries were ended: Which had so few Writers, and those say so little of the Forms themselves, that I declared beforehand, this Evidence must be made up of particular and probable Proofs; all which put together would amount to these Conclusions; That Forms were used from the beginning, and so were ancient and lawful (which some Dissenters deny); and that it is very probable, whole Liturgies were both prescribed and used before the end of this Period: Which is a sufficient foundation for the Evidence in the Fourth Century, That (when the Church was settled) Liturgies were then enjoyed, and invariably used. I am forced to be the larger in the discovery of this Fallacy, because nothing he hath said would look like an Answer, if he did not every where repeat this piece of Sophistry, and set aside my Proofs, only because they did not reach his Point, as he had falsely stated it.

Again, He supposes I was only to Answer Mr. Cl. and on that occasion determines what I was to prove, and what not. He saith, *Mr. Cl. doth not assert Forms to be intrinsically Evil; but some Dissenters do, (tho' this Opinion reflect upon Jesus, who taught a Form to his Disciples) and Forms being the parts of Liturgy, to confute those who condemn all Forms, and justify the foundation of Liturgies, in a History of them it is not improper to prove Forms lawful.* 2ly, *Mr. Cl. denies not, that there were arbitrary and particular Forms of old: And did not I disprove all his particular Instances of arbitrary Forms, and shew they were constantly used and fixed in every Eminent Church?* 3dly, *Mr. Cl. owns the Lords Prayer was used anciently, though far otherwise than of late.* This I considered also, proving the use of it as a Form, and the annexing it to all solemn Offices, as it is used now. 4ly, He grants *divers Churches agreed in a certain Order, to administer the several parts of Worship.* And I proved, this Order could be nothing but a prescribed Liturgy, *Par. II. Chap. 4. pag. 201.* Now, if he will be answering a Book before he have read it over, I cannot help that. 5ly, *Mr. Cl. saith, They prayed for the same things, but not in the same words.* But I shewed, his Instances were mistaken, and that in the same Church many parts of Service were in the same words. 6ly, *Mr. Cl. declares,* he

he meant by prescribed Forms, such as are imposed on the Minister, so as those and no other must be used, without adding, detracting, or transposing. This is indeed the strictest Notion of an enjoined Liturgy; yet I agreed with Mr.Cl. as to this definition, only we differed about the time when Forms began to be thus enjoined; he affirmed it was not sooner than the end of the Fifth Century; I proved, many Forms were invariably used in the first Three Centuries, and enjoined in the Fourth and beginning of the Fifth Centuries, which sufficed to confute Mr.Cl. So that Mr.S.B. calls on me to do that which I had done before; and though he meddle with nothing but the first Three Centuries, where I was only to shew what steps were made towards enjoined Forms in this strict Sense, he most disingenuously brags, *That my Quotations reach not my Point, unless they prove Forms enjoined in the strictest Sense, in these Centuries; which were Ages of Inspiration, and before the Church was settled.* Now this barefaced Fallacy takes away two whole Centuries which Mr.Cl. had freely given me to prove such enjoined Forms, and starts a New Question, being designed meerly to prepossess his Reader against all my probable Proofs, and all my Instances of the constant use of Forms of all kinds, yea, against the invariable use of a whole Liturgy, under the false pretence, That I undertook to prove (by every particular Quotation) that Forms, yea, Liturgies were strictly enjoined throughout these Ages. But I appeal to my Introduction, to *Par.I. pag. 77* and to all my Inferences, whether I undertook to do this in this Period, or no? and the Candid Reader shall judge, whether it was necessary for me to do all this, to confute Mr.Cl. who said such enjoined Forms came not in till 200 years after Mr.S.B's Period was ended; though after all, to compleat my History, I have found divers Proofs, that shew enjoined Forms in the strictest sense in these Ages.

Before I proceed to examine his Particulars, I shall require these general Observations of his, by some general Remarks on the proceedings of both my Adversaries:

First, Neither of them hath produced one positive Evidence, so much as of the use of arbitrary or extempore Prayer; they offer nothing but remote Conjectures and very slender Probabilities for it, in this Period. Now, I have brought expresse proof of the use of Forms, in this time; and more (as well as clearer)

Proba-

Probabilities of the invariable use of Forms: So that doubtless the advantage is on my side, and 'tis not fair to demand such Evidence as the Times do not afford, and such as they cannot bring either against my Opinion, or for their own.

Secondly, Tho' there be not many Proofs of a Whole Liturgy prescribed before the 4th Century, yet then divers Liturgies were written down, and at that time claimed an Original much elder, either from the Apostles or very ancient Tradition; And the Authors who speak of them, or any parts of them, suppose them to have been in use long before this time. Wherefore (according to *S. Augustine*) *That which is observed by the whole Church, and was not instituted by Councils, but hath been always kept; this is accounted to be of Apostolical Institution. De Bapt. contr. Donat. l. 4. c. 23.* which being applied to Liturgies, will go a great way to prove their Original was from the Apostles; however, they must be elder than this Fourth Century.

Thirdly, When Mr. C. and my Examiner have granted Forms ancient and lawful, it seems to me very needless to enquire when the Church first enjoyed them: For if the Church have power to enjoin any thing in Gods Service, it cannot be in things unlawful; so that whatever is in it self lawful, especially if it be Primitive, and (in her Opinion) useful, she may enjoin to her own Members, and then it becomes necessary to them; and if they forsake her Communion for this, they are Schismatics: So that they should have denied the lawfulness of Forms, if they designed to quarrel at the enjoying them.

Fourthly, Since Mr. S. B. sets up for an Examiner, he should have enquired into all those Pages where my probable Proofs and Inferences are strengthened with explicatory and collateral Evidence: To let all these pass by unanswered, and tell us, He thinks the Author meant otherwise, without confuting my Reasons and Instances, or confirming his own Thoughts, is something too assuming.

Fifthly, He often appeals to his Friend (whom he knew to be of his side) or to the Reader, to judge between Mr. C. and me, upon his bare Insinuation, that I am in the wrong, referring them to both our Books: Out of which, no doubt, the indifferent Reader would have judged more impartially, if no Examiner had appeared. But if they must have this trouble still, especially

B

in

in the most difficult Cases, I would fain know, to what purpose did Mr.S.B. write his *Examination*?

Sixthly, He boasts as if the Cause were lost, when he thinks he hath run down but one of my particular Instances, or probable Proofs. But there are so many Evidences, and such variety of this kind of Proofs, which being put together, make out the general Conclusion, That the Cause cannot suffer much, though some particular Instance should fail.

Lastly, He rejects all my clear Proofs, That Hymns and Praises were in prescribed Forms, as wholly impertinent to the Question, accusing me of needless Tautologies for urging them: Whereas the greatest part of *Liturgies* are Praises; and whatever proves the *Praises* were prescribed Forms, undeniably proves at least, one half of the Public Service was prescribed; and makes it probable the petitionary part of the same Service was so also (as I shewed before, *Par.I. pag.24, 25.*) Nor can he evade this consequence till he give a substantial Reason, why the Laudatory part of a Liturgy should be in Forms prescribed, and the Prayers left arbitrary; Which will be very hard to do, because Prayers and Praises are so intermixed, as to be inseparable. *Daniel's* Devotions were Prayers and Thanksgivings, *Dan. vi. 10.* The Apostles praying, sang a Hymn, *Acts xvi. 25.* Our Lord joyned a Doxology to his Prayer, *Math. vi. 13.* *S. Paul* often puts Prayer and Praise together, *1 Cor. xiv. 15. Philip. iv. 6. 1 Thess. v. 17, 18. 1 Tim. ii. 1.* The most ancient Forms of Prayer (like the Lords Prayer) end with a Doxology, and the most famous Hymns, the *Te Deum Gloria in excelsis*, the *Trisagion*, and those in *Prudentius*, &c. And the Psalms of *David* are so mixt of Prayers and Praises, that none can sing or say them, but they bless God and pray to him by the same Form: So that Praises and Prayers being essential parts of the same Worship, so like each other, so often inseparably mixed together, and so constantly united, What reason can be given, why the Hymns and Praises being certainly prescribed, the Prayers should not be so also? And to reject all that proves the Praises were prescribed Forms, as impertinent to a History of Liturgy, shews much Ignorance or Inconsideration; unless it be a politick invention to cover his inability, to answer so much and so clear Evidence as there is on that subject. These general Remarks will help to shorten my Answer, and so

so I hope may obtain the Readers pardon, though they look like a digression.

§.2. *Pag. 3.* My aim from Scripture was to prove, Forms were not only used, but also enjoyed, as an acceptable way of praising God, and praying to him. And I produced three Forms, one of Praise, *Exod. xv. 1.* another of Blessing, *Numb. vi. 23.* a third of Prayer, *Deut. xxvi. 5, &c. & ver. 13.* Mr. S. B. objects nothing to any of the particulars; but saith, *I should prove, they did not, or might not use any Prayers or Praises, but those very Forms.* And surely this appears sufficiently as to the occasions upon which these words were prescribed, because they were all composed by Moses, upon the several occasions mentioned in the Text, and that by Gods direction: Now can we suppose that any private Priest durst make another Form of Blessing, or any Jew offer his Tithes and First-fruits with a new Form of his own Composing? *Fagius* saith, *They were so strict as to the Blessing, that in after-Ages they kept the very Hebrew Original words.* Vid. *Crit. Sacr. in Numb. 6.* And when God by his inspired Prophet (*Hos. xiv. 2, 3.*) not only directs the penitent Jews, what sort of words to use, but sets down the Form it self; No doubt if any of them had presumed to alter those words, his presumption would have caused him to be rejected. Wherefore Forms (which no private Man may vary) are a way of serving God, justified by the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

Pag. 4. The same appears by the Psalms, indited by the Spirit of God for the public service of the Temple, which I proved by Scripture; and Mr. S. B. denies it not, only he saith, *From Gods enjoying these, we cannot infer, that Men may devise Prayers, and oblige the Church to use them and no other.* But can Men find out a better way of serving God, than that which God himself chose, that is, by Forms enjoyed? 'Tis true, they had Inspired men to compose those Forms then; but though the Authors of ours were not Inspired, yet if their Compositions do agree in all things with Holy Scripture, and contradict it in nothing, they cannot offend (supposing the Forms unexceptionable) by imitating that Method which God and inspired Ages have set them, which is, enjoying Forms taken out of the Psalms, and other places of Holy Scripture, and out of such ancient Compositions as are no

way repugnant to it. But further, I cited six learned Authors in the Margin, and two in the Text, to prove the Jews anciently had a Liturgy. Mr. S. B. knew the thing could not be denied, wherefore he politickly pretends, *It would be too great a diversion to enquire whether their proofs are solid*; and intimates, he could shew, *that two of my Authors build their proof for some things upon unjustifiable Authorities*. This is to evade, not to answer. Surely it was the business of an Examiner to enquire; and to say he can do that which he doth not, when there was a just occasion for it, is an intimation he cannot answer their proofs: So that I shall take it for granted, the Jews had a Liturgy (till the contrary be better made out) and refer the Reader to the consequences deduced from that Truth, *Hist. of Lit. pag. 4.* and at last Mr. S. B. supposes, that Forms might have been of general use among the Jews: And then the next question is, *Whether this way of serving God was abrogated in the New Testament?* I gave divers Reasons why such an abrogation was necessary, if Christ had disliked that way to which the Jews had been generally and long accustomed, and intended to set up a new one. He answers, *that he sees no necessity of such an abrogation, to warrant People to address themselves to God in another way*; for he supposes *both ways lawful*. Now if he grant that, *First*; Then the way of stinted Forms is not unlawful nor unsuitable to Gospel-worship: *Secondly*, This way was never disliked by Christ, nor hath he brought any proof, that he instituted any other way: *Thirdly*, Therefore it is most likely the Jewish Converts would keep to their old way of stinted Forms, and that implies them to be very ancient: *Fourthly*, If both ways were now equally lawful, yet the Church having chosen and enjoined the Liturgick way, as the most ancient, universal and profitable way, and rejected the other; Her determination makes this way (which was only lawful before) to become necessary to us, till that determination be revoked.

Pag. 5. But Mr. S. B. foresees a dreadful consequence (which he hopes I never thought of) from my arguing, *That the Jews worshiped God acceptably by set Forms, and that Christ and his Apostles joyned in that way, and never reprov'd it*; Ergo, *Christians now must use none but the Jewish Forms*. This gives occasion to his pity for those, who by Reading learned Books, entertain No-
tions

tions destructive of Christianity. I wish this Examiner had read more, or writ less; for then the World had not been troubled with long Harangues upon his own imaginations. He cannot deny the Antecedent, all learned Men assert it; but this Consequence is a *Memo* of his own dressing up, which vanishes by considering, That when Christ and his Apostles joyned in the Jewish Forms, the Temple and Synagogue-worship was the lawful established way of serving God: But when the Levitical part of their Religion was altered; that part of their Liturgy which related to it, became unpracticable to Christians, and fell off it self; yet still the Psalms and the Moral part of the Jewish Forms, suited the Christian Doctrin, and our Lord had approved of that way; therefore these Forms might be, and were retained and imitated by the Primitive Church; and they did this the rather to win the Jews, who (as I noted) never objected, that Christ, or his Apostles, or the first Christians, had set up a new way of praying and praising God: Wherefore to make so many spiteful Reflections upon those great men, from whom I borrowed the Antecedent, for the shadow of a sham Consequence, that no Logick can infer from the premisses, discovers neither a Christian spirit, nor common Ingenuity: For no man who considers, will think that Christ and his Apostles joyning in the Jewish worship before it was fully abrogated, can oblige us to copy out their whole Service after the Ceremonial Law is dead and long since buried.

Pag. 6. That Christ did collect his Prayer out of the Jewish Forms, and order his Disciples to add it to their other prayers, as a badge of their relation to him, is too so true and so well proved by variety of learned Men, that Mr. S. B. instead of disproving the premisses, terrifies us with another dangerous consequence; which is, that *this is a reflection on the infinite wisdom of the Son of God.* This makes me think of him *David* speaks of, *Psal. L. 21. who thought wickedly God was even such an one as himself.* Some men fancy, it is a reflection on their gifts and great parts, not to be at liberty to shew them in Extempore Compositions, and will needs apply this to the Blessed Jesus, who indeed had the Spirit without measure, and was infinitely able to make what new Prayer he pleased Extempore. But our Dear Lord designed not on all occasions to shew his infinite ability; he came
to

to teach us humility and submission to innocent Establishments, and so might judge it more expedient for his Disciples to collect a Prayer out of the practical part of the Jewish Liturgy (endited at first by men who had the Spirit of God) than to make a new one: And if they were really endued with his Spirit, who pretend to it, they would follow his Example herein, and not for ostentation of their imaginary abilities, reject our lawful enjoyned Forms, disturb our peace, and leave our Communion. However, since it is certain our Lord did collect his Prayer out of the Jewish Forms, it is they who make frivolous consequences from hence who reflect upon him, not they who relate the Matter of Fact, for which doubtless our Saviour had excellent Reasons, and far better perhaps than we are able to assign. Like to this is his last frightful consequence, *That this would prove our Saviour would have his Followers compose Forms, only out of the Liturgy of the Jews.* If he means this of the Ceremonial part of it, 'tis evidently false, for Christ did not collect one Petition from thence; if he means from the Moral part of it, I see no harm in the consequence at all; and it is certain the Primitive Christians did use the *Psalms*, the *Hosannas*, *Hallelujahs*, *Holy, Holy, Holy, &c.* and other Old Testament-Forms in their Service, which were parts of the Jewish Liturgy: But it could never be the intent of Christ to oblige us to collect our whole Liturgy from thence, because he taught New Doctrins, and instituted new Rites, and gave his Apostles a miraculous Gift on purpose to suit new Administrations, to that which was New in the Christian Religion; and the early agreement of those distant Churches which they planted, in these Administrations, not only as to the method, but the main words of them, is a good evidence, That the same Spirit directed them all to appoint Forms, from the very beginning.

§. 3. pag. 7. His own loose consequences do not discourage him from censuring me as discouraging too loosely. Wherefore having passed by our Saviours Hymn, and his Prayer in the Garden, clear instances of his choosing, allowing and using Forms both of Prayer and Praise. He gives our Saviours Prayer on the Cross (which (I said) *was probably taken out of Psal. xxii.*) as an instance of my loose discouraging; asking me, *Who put the petitions in Form*
for

for Christ, and obliged him to use no other words? I reply to his Insinuation, That if my Conjecture be too loose, he should and might have confuted it; but his not attempting that, shews it was close enough. To his Question I answer, David by the Spirit of Prophecy long before composed this Prayer for Christ, as appears by his voluntary choosing of this Form, when he could have made a New prayer; and if my Examiner will allow, he prayed by the Spirit when he used this Form, then it is no loose inference, to say, *We may pray by the Spirit in using Forms*; and to affirm, *It is no hardship to enjoyn men to serve God in that way which Jesus chose as the best, when he was free from all constraints, and infinitely more able than any of us to have prayed otherwise.*

In my 8th page, I proved by S. Austin and Beza, That the Apostles both used and settled Forms; and from others, that prescribed Forms had been used from the Apostolical times. Mr. S. B. (I doubt) thought this too close, and so never offers to answer it. But when I had granted the Lords Prayer to be both a Form and a Direction to draw other Forms by; And, That Liturgies are other words indeed, but such as are agreeable to it (i.e. to the Lords Prayer) both as to the Form and Matter of them: The Examiner first adds [No] to my words, and cites them thus, *Liturgies are No other words, &c.* and then insinuates they are Non-sense, and an odd Expression to fall from a learned Doctor: But I am sure, 'tis an odd Trick of a Non-conforming Conformist to put [No] into the midst of a Sentence, to be so greedy of making reflections (after his promise to the contrary) that he falsifies my words, to get an opportunity. The adding [No] to Scripture it self, may make it non-sense or blasphemy; and if I should add it to his Preface, and say, *He is no Conformist, he useth not the Liturgy*; some think I had not done him much wrong, though he would no doubt have resented it. Well, leave out [No] then here, and my sense is plain, That Liturgies are other words, different in syllables from the Lords Prayer, but agreeing to it, both as to the Form or method of the Petitions, and as to the Subject matter of them, which I proved by an induction of particulars, pag. 10. to which he doth not vouchsafe any answer: But upon my granting, the Lords Prayer was a Direction as well as a Form, he asks a notable Question, and repeats it again, pag. 9. viz. *Why may not a Minister keeping*

keeping to the words of the Lords Prayer, use other words than those in the Liturgy, as well as the Liturgy-men use other words than those in the Lords Prayer? this had been close, if he had not forgot our Ministers circumstances. The Church hath drawn up a Liturgy very carefully, following the direction of the Lords Prayer, and (for such Reasons as he may find in my 2d Part, pag. 325) enjoined all Ministers to use it constantly, and they have (sincerely I hope) consented thereto. Now to ask his Question in our case, is to ask, why every Captain, who thinks himself wiser than his superior Officer, may not cross the Orders given by his General, or a Council of War, and give new ones to his own Company. He must find out some Reason as New as an Extempore prayer, to prove that private Ministers in a settled Church, ought to have liberty to do all those Acts which their Governors may do, before his Question can concern us, or be worth answering.

To go on, Mr. C. brought many Authorities to shew, that the ancient Christians used the Lords prayer not out of any apprehension that it was enjoined, *Math. vi.* These Quotations I examined particularly, and shewed they were not sufficient for his purpose. Mr. S. B. who loves not to meddle with reading, instead of examining my Answers, refers the Reader to examine them himself; only among eight Authors he picks out *Maldonat*, whose sense (without citing his very words) I said was only, *That we are not always bound to use the very words of the Lords Prayer*: And *Maldon* doth not only say, *Non his necessariis verbis* —, but *ut quotiescunque oramus — omnia, aut aliqua, aut nihil certe his contrarium peterimus*. However Mr. S. B. conceives his Sense to be, *That we are not absolutely bound to use those very words at any time*: Which not only contradicts *Maldonat's* words, but shews my Examiner did not know this Author was a Jesuit, and a rigid Papist, bound by the Rules of his Church and Order to say so many *Paternosters* every Day; otherwise he could not have asserted this Jesuit so openly turned Fanatick, as to affirm in a Book which was to pass the Censors, *That no man is bound at any time to say a Pater-Noster*: He follows this with a notable Question (which Examiners and some others claim a privilege to ask) viz. *If we be not always bound to use the Lords words, how we came to be bound to use always other peoples words?*

I reply, We of this Church are bound to use the Lords Prayer as often as we use the Liturgy in public; and sincere Conformists deliberately bound themselves to use the Lords words and the Churches too in all their public Administrations, believing them to be fitter for those occasions than any they can invent. How Mr.S.B. came to be bound, he knows best, perhaps Advantage drew him to do that which he now dislikes; but he should have asked this Question before, and then he had escaped the Snare of *making enquiry after Vows*, Prov.xx.25.

§.4. pag. 8. I had owned there was an extraordinary Gift of Prayer in the Apostles times and long after, which I observed, none could claim by Scripture in this Age, and answered all the places produced by some for this claim, in four or five Pages: To which Mr.S.B. gives no Answer, but is very large in giving us his own Notion of the Gift of Prayer, which he defines, *An ability to represent the sentiments of a Soul duly affected with the general and particular matter of prayer in suitable Expressions, proper to beget and improve such affections and resentments in those, who shall hear and joyn in the use of them to that purpose.* A Logician can no more reduce this definition to his Rules of Art, than he can give a regular Analysis of an Extempore prayer; yet, if I admit it for a description, my Cause is not hurt, since (according to this Character) he that reads the Liturgy doth exercise the Gift of prayer, as well or better than the Extempore man. For our Clergy and well instructed People, upon rational grounds believe, the Expressions of the Liturgy to be more proper, than they or any can invent or utter on the sudden, without the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Ghost: So that every pious Minister of our Church hath his Soul duly affected with the general and particular matter of Prayer, and an ability to represent the sentiments of his Soul in expressions, suitable and proper to beget and improve such affections and resentments in all the true lovers of Common-Prayer, who hear and joyn with him. Wherefore by his account the Dissenters have no monopoly of this Gift of Prayer; and if our hearts be duly affected we have more title to it than they; for our Expressions have been all duly weighed by Admirable men, and we may know the general and particular

C

cular matter of them before-hand, by meditating whereon our Souls may be more affected than any can rationally be supposed to be, by an Expression that flies by like a flash of Lightning. 'Tis true, Mr. S. B. denies, that such as pray Extempore, expect the assistance of the Spirit only to teach them new words and phrases for their daily prayers: But (as he states the point) the only difference between their exercise of this Gift and ours, is this, They frequently or daily vary the phrases, and we use the same: As to the propriety of expressions, affections, and sentiments, we and our people have the advantage: And say what he will, he lays great weight upon new phrases, for he affirms, *The exercise of this Gift cannot well consist with an obligation constantly to use the same words.* The absurdity of which appears; First, By the censure this passes upon him, who (if this be true) when he subscribed and declared, renounced the use of one of Gods gifts: Secondly, By the sentence it passes upon all sincere Conformists, who (by this account) do never pray by the Spirit, merely for want of new expressions, though their expressions be never so proper, their Souls never so much affected and their People never so devout: So that I may refer it to the Reader, whether he hath abused himself or his Brethren more by this rash expression.

Now when he had made new phrases the distinguishing Character of the Gift of prayer, he did well to say, *It is no extraordinary Gift:* For it is a meer natural faculty, depending on mens parts and temper, attained by confidence and use, like the Art of making Speeches. An easie Observer may see, that the fluency, the variety, and the style, follow the complexion and disposition of the Speaker; the Sanguine are brisk and airy in these prayers, the Flegmatic, slow and flat; the Cholerick, bold and fierce; the Melancholy, sad and dismal; yea, the same man is quicker or slower, as his Body or Mind is well or ill-disposed: So that no considering person will ascribe such a Quality as this to the Spirit of God; There being no promise, that God will assist us in public Prayer with new phrases; and it is a great presumption, to expect that which God never promised, and a greater, to ascribe the effects of mens natural tempers, to the operation of the Holy Ghost. What he adds, *That Men have ordinarily a readiness to express their Sense in proper words,* is not true in the case of public

public Prayer; for many pious and learned Ministers, who have a very affectionate sense of the matter of Prayer, cannot express themselves suitably to their inward resentments, (as he calls it) yet many Ignorants or Hypocrites, who have no sense of him they speak to, or that they pray for, can express themselves fluently on any occasion.

Pag. 9. It is a Paradox to me, when there are very pertinent words, *how other words, only equally pertinent, should contribute more to the ends of public Worship*: His instance of the Lords Prayer and Liturgies will not make it out; the Lords Prayer is more pertinent for those occasions for which Christ made it, than any human Composition can be: But our Lord designed not this short Prayer for the whole Service, but to be added to our other Prayers, and to direct the Church to frame other Prayers by it; and our Church hath observed both these orders. He hath been told already, why every private Minister cannot have the same liberty, that the Governours of a settled Church have: As for his supposing these Ministers would vary no more from the Lords Prayer (if they had liberty) than the Liturgy doth; first this is very unlikely, because some of those who take this liberty, neither use the Lords Prayer as a Form, nor mind it as a direction for their Extempore prayers: And secondly, the project is impracticable among 10000 Clergy-men; for some are unwilling to have a liberty of varying, others are unfit to be trusted with it, in which number are many who (through a conceit of their own abilities) desire it; and there are but very few who are fit to be allowed such a liberty, that do press for it. Wherefore since this liberty cannot be granted to all, the distinguishing would be so difficult, and the denying it to some so exasperating, that it is better to restrain a few from the exercise of their needless gifts, (where we have already properer Expressions than any of them can invent) than to bring all those mischiefs on a settled Church, which either a general allowance, or a distinguishing dispensation must create.

His second illustration of the aforesaid Paradox, is by my Paraphrases on the Common Prayer, by which I thought to further devotion: *And if they be of real use* (he asks) *why may not other variations be in their measure useful too?* I reply, That Commentaries and Paraphrases on Scripture (for private use)

are very advantagious. But if Dr. Hammond, or the Assembly, had drawn up their Paraphrases and Notes on purpose to be read in Churches, to exclude the reading of Scripture there, out of a conceit, they were more useful than reading Chapters of the Bible, they would have been ridiculous, and deserved a severe Censure: So in Human Compositions, *Durandus* and *Cabasila's* explications of the Liturgies, and the exposition of the Canons by *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* are useful in private. But if these Authors had designed to have their Expositions publicly used, so as to juggle out the old Liturgies and Canons, they would have been despised for their insolence, as much as they are now commended for their industry. Now his Extempore men would have their variations only and always used in public instead of the Liturgy, so as utterly to exclude it, which utterly spoils the parallel: This he perceived, and therefore owns, *That my Variations are not to be used publicly*, pag. 10. I ask, why then did he instance in them, since he himself affirms, pag. 11. *The matter now in dispute is only about him that officiates?* But my Paraphrases being not at all intended for the use of Ministers, or others in public, therefore they are nothing to the purpose of *Variations designed for public use, exclusive of the Liturgy*. His next Question is, *Whether my Paraphrases be ever the better for being only for private use?* I answer, This makes his alledging them in an Argument about publick Variations, appear frivolous and impertinent. But if he delight in Comparisons, a private Minister, who makes Variations for private use, to promote Uniformity and Devotion, and to beget in all a just esteem of the established way of Worship, doth much better than he, who to shew his ability to vary, uses his faculty in public, to exclude the established way, and thereby breeds a contempt of it, and promotes separation from it.

Pag. 10. I granted (pag. 16.) *That every good man might pray, by the ordinary assistance of the Spirit, devoutly and fervently even by a Form: Mr. S. B. leaves out the main words [even by a Form] and falls to make Inferences from half my Sentence, asking, If Men may be so enlightened and affected, &c. why they may not by the ordinary assistance of the Spirit express their resentments in proper Expressions?* If he mean, in private, perhaps they may; but that is nothing to our Question, which is only about public Prayer;

if

if he mean in public, I have already given him divers Reasons why this cannot be permitted, much less established in a settled Church: But in short, I will give him here three Reasons; First, This liberty is needless, because there are more proper Expressions already composed by Holy men (who had the ordinary assistance of the Spirit) than any of us can invent on the sudden. Secondly, This liberty would be pernicious, occasioning Envy among the Clergy, and Factions among the People; some of the most learned and pious would be despised only for their modesty; and others of the most ignorant and profane, admired for their fluency and confidence. Thirdly, Supposing both ways of praying by enjoined Forms and Extempore were equal; yet when our Church (being guided by antiquity, reason, and the practice of other modern Churches) hath prohibited that way, and prescribed Forms, they are certainly the better way for us.

Pag. 11. He yields at last, *That the frame and actings of the Soul, the exercise of Faith, Repentance, Love, &c. are the principal thing in Prayer.* Now when I had proved, that a Minister may do all this, and so pray by the Spirit in a Form; why may he not be obliged always to use a Form in public? Mr. S. B. can object nothing but this, *If the enjoined Form do not so well express that sense, which he and others have of the Matter of Prayer, as other words which occur to him, then he cannot be said to pray in or by the Spirit, in the full import of the phrase.* Now this Supposition shews, first, That these men have a high opinion of their own Invention, who think they can devise better words Extempore, than our Reverend makers of the Liturgy could frame by much study: Secondly, 'Tis plain, *That using these new Phrases* (by his account) *the full and only import of Praying by the Spirit;* for he makes varying the phrase necessary to the exercise of it, and his Extempore man is singular in nothing else. But he should consider, this is a Scripture-phrase, and the import of it is to be learned from thence; wherefore he should have brought some Text, where *Praying by the Spirit*, signifies, *Inventing new Phrases*, but that he can never do; and reason is against his Exposition, as well as Scripture; for since he owns *new Words* not to be the principal thing in Prayer, no man will believe the Spirit's assistance is necessary for the less principal; yea, (where we have proper

proper Phrases already) for a needless thing. Wherefore when in the use of our Forms our Soul is in good frame, and we exercise all proper Graces, by the assistance of the Spirit; we *Pray by the Spirit*, in all Senses that the phrase is capable of, but Two, which are of Mr.S.B's own devising; first, that we do not daily invent new Words; nor secondly, do we vainly imagine we can invent more proper Words, than the Church hath provided.

After this he runs back to my 15th Page, where I had shewed, That if Praying by the Spirit signifie, *making new Words and Phrases*, then none but the Minister, in public, prays by the Spirit, since the people never invent new Words, but the Ministers words are a Form to them. The Examiner tugs hard to get off from this Rock, and saith first, *The dispute is only about him that officiates*. But had he read over the place he pretends to confute, he must have seen I was answering Mr.Clarkson, who (*Disc.of Lit. pag.128,129.*) makes *Praying by the Spirit*, a gift common to all Christians; and yet afterwards saith, *He that was able to conceive a Prayer himself, yet made use of prayers formed by others; he did not pray as he was able*; which he makes to be all one with *praying by the Spirit*. The absurdity of which Assertion I proved by this scandalous Consequence of it, that then the People (whom he affirms to have this Gift in all Ages) did never pray by the Spirit, because they make use of Forms made by others; so that here our dispute was about the People. For by this I made it appear, how falsely they expounded the phrase of *praying by the Spirit*, by *inventing new Words*; which excludes the People from ever praying by the Spirit at all. Secondly, Mr.S.B.s saith, *The Ministers prayer is not a Form to the Congregation in the Sense we are discoursing of*. I answer, *It is a prayer framed by another*, and that is Mr.Clarkson's sense of a Form, and (I think) Mr. S. B's too, who saith in this very Page, if a man *restrain himself to the words and phrases put together by others, which express not their sense so well as some that occur to them, &c.* Here a Form is defined, *Words and Phrases put together by others*, and the using it, *restraining ones self to those words*. Now the people are restrained to words and phrases put together by the Minister, therefore his Prayer is a Form to them: And if one of the Congregation conceive, he can express his sense better than his Minister doth, and

and yet sits by silent; and uses the Ministers words to express his sense; according to Mr. C. this man doth not pray *as well as he is able*; and according to Mr. S. B. *he prays not by the Spirit in the full import of the phrase*; which natural, yet odious Consequence, should make them ashamed of their explaining this phrase of *Praying by the Spirit*, by *inventing new Expressions*. Thirdly, Mr. S. B. saith, *The Congregation may joyn in the spiritual performance of the duty, acting Graces suitable to the occasions, and improving others abilities to further their Devotion*. This, he designs to prove, That the Ministers prayer is not a Form to the People; but I affirm, the Congregation (who joyn in the Common-Prayer) do, or may do all this; yet I hope Mr. S. B. will not affirm, that their joyning in the Spiritual performance, acting Graces, and using the abilities of the Liturgy-makers to further their Devotion, proves the Common-Prayer is no Form to our People. Lastly, he affirms, *That the Congregation are not called to express vocally their inward resentments in the fittest words they are able*. I reply, They are commanded to *pray by the Spirit in public as well as in private*; and if they may not use their own Expressions there, then they may pray by the Spirit, without using their own words; and praying fervently is the main import of that phrase. Besides, he runs from the point, to tell us what is the duty of Ministers, and what the Peoples: For our Question here is, Whether their being tied to their Ministers Prayer, do not make it a Form to them? not, Whether they should be tied to his words, or no? If I grant, they ought to be tied to his words, that makes them not less a Form to them; but I may note, that he cannot produce one place of Scripture where (as he phrases it) Ministers are called to speak all the Office alone, or to express their sense in new phrases daily, or where the People are forbid to say any part of the Prayers: If he cannot shew Scripture for these ways of the Dissenters, he is highly to blame to apply the Canting-phrase of, *A Call* (which implies, a *Divine Command*) to *meer human devices*. 'Tis apparent from the best antiquity since the Apostles, and from the Jewish Custom, that the people joyned both in Praises and Prayers by Responses, Repetitions, &c. contrary to which the Dissenters now confine the People wholly to the Ministers words throughout their Extempore Prayers; and then by a
wrong.

wrong exposition of the *praying by the Spirit*, abuse their own Congregations, as much as they do those who use the Liturgy, and exclude them as well as us from Praying by the Spirit.

Pag. 12. I granted there was an extraordinary Gift of Prayer, in and after the Apostles days, the Spirit furnishing some then both with words and matter: This I proved by *S. Chrysostom*, who notes it was ceased long before his time; and I made it probable that the Original of Liturgies, was from Prayers edited at first by these Inspired men, and preserved in writing by some for the benefit of after-Ages, (*Hist. Lit. pag. 17.*) Mr. *S. B.* objects, That I have none but *S. Chrysostom* to vouch for this Gift. And, is not he a good Evidence for a matter of Fact so near his own time, when Mr. *S. B.* hath not one Father nor Argument to disprove him? But he startles at a dreadful Consequence of his own dressing up, *viz.* That *this would make Liturgies, to be Divine Revelations*; which he represents as little less than Blasphemy. Now to put him out of his affright, he must consider; First, That there is great difference between Holy Scripture, written by Inspired men on purpose to be a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners, and certainly delivered to us as the very Word of God; and Forms occasionally used or composed by some Inspired man, accidentally preserved, as some Liturgick Forms, and some Sayings of the Apostles (not Recorded in the New Testament) were: So that the affirming the Primitive part of Liturgy was made at first by Inspired men, doth not equal it to Scripture. Secondly, This Primitive part of Liturgy, is either the very words of Scripture, or so pious, pure, pertinent, and agreeable to it, that it is no reflection on the Spirit of God to say, this was derived from the Prayers of Inspired men. Thirdly, The agreement of distant Churches so early in the same Forms, cannot well be made out, unless we allow these Forms were made at first by that one Spirit, which inspired all the planters of these several Churches. Lastly, It is far more arrogant, and nearer Blasphemy, to ascribe modern, extempore Prayers to Inspiration, (as the People are taught to do); to charge the Holy Spirit with the blunders, tautologies, non-sense, and impertinencies of this way, must provoke God with a witness. I might also here shew, that two Popish Impostors first brought
up

up this way of Extempore prayer in England, and that many who were great admirers of it, have fallen off to Quakerism, &c. but that is done by other hands (a). I return (a) See *Power and Fire*, pag. 7, & 17. *Continuator of Friend-ly debates*, pag. 113. some of our latest Liturgies, have some Prayers in them, whose very frame shews they were not composed by Inspiration. If he say this of the modern corrupt Additions to old Liturgies, it is nothing to the purpose, because we consider nothing here but the Primitive part of these Liturgies: If he mean it of our Common-Prayer (one of the best and latest Liturgies) I affirm, the meanest Collect there is fitter to be ascribed to Inspiration, than the best Extempore Prayer I ever heard; yet we do not equal them to Holy Scripture. And now I hope it is plain, my Examiner hath said nothing to lessen the value of Liturgies, or raise the credit of the Extempore way. I will next consider, whether he hath any better skill or success in examining Authors, than in refuting Scripture Arguments.

The First Century.

§.1. pag. 13. **T**O avoid all Cavil, and prevent Fallacies, I will first shew what I undertook to prove in this Century; which was, *That the Christians had Forms of Prayer and Praise*, pag. 21, and *a Liturgy or Order at least*, pag. 22. *That their Hymns were certainly in prescribed Forms*, pag. 25. *Their Prayer and Supplication one, and approved by the Bishop; their Singing alternate*, pag. 27. This was all I undertook to prove in an Age so full of inspired Pastors, and so deficient in Writers, wherein (as I noted, pag. 19) much evidence for Liturgies cannot be expected: And if we find some steps made towards a Liturgy invariably used thus early, we may be sure, as Gifts decreased, the use of Forms in every Age must proportionably increase.

My first proof is from *Josephus*, who saith, *The Essenes used early in the Morning, Prayers delivered them from their Fore-fathers*, *De bell. Jud. l. 2. c. 7.* now these must be Forms: *Philo* adds, *They sang Hymns alternately*; *De vit. contemp.* which must be known

D

Forms

Forms also; and *Eusebius* (who from *Philo's* description, took them to be Christians converted by *S. Mark*) observes, *their Hymns were the same with those sung in the Church in his time.* All this the Examiner grants, and this is enough for my purpose, because it proves, That such as were taken to be Christians by their agreement with the Primitive Rites, certainly had and used Forms both of Prayer and Praise. He only cavils about *Eusebius's* not mentioning their Forms of Prayer: Suppose he do not, *Josephus* (who knew the *Essenes* better) affirms, they had Forms of Prayer, so that this thing is certainly true and sufficiently proved: And *Philo* adds, *They were wont every day to pray Morning and Evening.* De vii. contemp. pag. 893. which *Eusebius* leaves out, as he also doth many other things about the *Essenes* in *Philo*, contenting himself to tell us, That this Book of *Philo's*, which describes their practices, contains all the Rules and Canons of the Church in his time, and refers the Reader to the Book it self for fuller satisfaction. So that the most he can make of this Objection is, That *Eusebius* doth not expressly mention their Prayers in Forms; but he mentions their Hymns in Forms, which are so near of kin to Prayers, and generally contain Petitions as well as Praises, that the one makes it probable both were Forms; however *Josephus* puts it past all doubt, and therefore my Point is gained, which is, That the first we read of, who were taken to be Christians, had and used Forms both of Prayer and Praise.

§. 2. pag. 14. *Clemens Romanus* is my next Author, who useth the word [*Antistylis*] for an Order or Form of Divine Offices, and speaks of a determined Rule of Ministration. Mr. S. B. pretends I mistook the sense of this word, which (he saith) signifies a business, office, or work, and in his false and forced Paraphrase of this place applies it to the work of Lay-mens ordinary Calling. To confute which designed mistake, I shall give this brief account of the Author, and submit it to their Judgment who can read the Original: There was a Schism at *Corinth*, some of the Pastors despising the People, and some of the People intruding into the Pastors Office, which gave occasion to this Epistle, wherein *Clemens* adviseth them, to leave Divine Administrations to the Clergy, and to submit to them as Soldiers to their Captain,

*Captain, and the Members to their Head: He orders the Inferiors to be submissive, and the Superiors not to be proud; and then comes in the first place cited, Πάντα μέν ποιῶν ὁρίσας. ἅμα δὲ δακτύλῳ ἐπιταλὴν ἐκτελεσθῆναι, καὶ αὐτῷ ἐπιταλόμενος, τὰς τιμωρίας καὶ ἀντιπύας ἐκτελεσθῆναι. Let all things be done in Order, whatever the Lord hath commanded us to perform; and let the Oblations and Liturgies be celebrated at the certain or appointed Times. Clemens imitates S. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 40.) and speaks of Divine Offices as well as he, advising, that in them all things should be done in order; for these are the things about which our Lord hath given commands, and appointed the set-times for Oblations; that is, either the Eucharist in general, which is often so called; or the Alms then offered up, appointed at Corinth, on the First day of the Week, 1 Cor. xvi. 2. and then also they Celebrated Liturgies; that is, the solemn Offices of Prayer and Praise. But Mr. S. B's Paraphrase of this place (which he durst not cite at large) is this, God hath provided for every man, an office and work to which he must attend, and do every part of his work or Liturgy, in the manner God hath prescribed, and at the Season he hath appointed, &c. he leaves the word [Oblations] wholly out, because he could not well wrest that word to his feigned Sense of ordinary business, which the whole Period contradicts; for where did Christ require Lay-men to do all their business in order? Where hath he prescribed the manner and set-time for Lay-men's Work? And the next Sentence in Clemens baffles this pretence also, for he goes on thus, ——— The Lord hath not only determined the seasons for these, but also where and by whom they must be performed; (Is this true of mens ordinary Callings?) ——— So that they who make their Oblations at the set-time, are accepted and blessed, and cannot err, since they obey God ——— Even as the Chief-Priest had his proper Liturgy, appointed the Priests and Levites theirs, and the Laity were obliged to Lay-duties, (tis not *Religio* there.) We see he compares the Order of the Christian Church to that of the Jews, where there was a prescribed Rule for the High Priest, Priests and Levites to officiate by, which he calls a Liturgy, as he had named the Rule for Christian Priests performance of Divine Offices before; and the comparison shews as well the same word, That the Christians were prescribed as well as the Jews; as also he supposes, Lay-men might not meddle with these*

Offices now (having duties of their own) as well as under the Law. And from this Order, in the *Mosaic Oeconomy*, *Clemens* infers, That the *Christian Clergy* were every one of them in his proper place to offer up the Eucharist to God; keeping a good Conscience, and with all gravity keeping close to (τὴν ἀποφασισμένην καὶ καθορισμένην) the determined Rule of his Liturgy: Which refers to those various parts of the Offices which were performed, some by the Bishop, others by the Priests or Deacons; and every ones part was allotted by the Liturgy, which therefore must at least be (as I noted before) a fixed Rule or Order for Divine Administrations: And if they needed such a prescribed Order then, and had one as well as the Sons of *Levi* in this Inspired Age, we need a compleat Liturgy enjoined now, when Inspiration is ceased. *Clemens* goes on to shew, what *Christ* had determined about the place where, and the persons by whom Divine Offices were to be performed, pag. 95, 97. And the whole Discourse shows, the shameful prevarication of *Mr. S. B.* in explaining these passages of all Christian People, and (ἀνθρώπων) of Ordinary work, when in one Page, viz. pag. 92. it is thrice used, For the Rule for celebrating Divine Offices, which was fixed and prescribed, and that was a good step towards an enjoined Liturgy invariably to be used, if it were not the very thing it self.

§. 3. pag. 15: *Pliny* relates, That the Christians said an Hymn [carmen] alternately to *Christ*, as God, early in the Morning: My Examiner saith, this only relates to Psalms or Hymns, and I would draw in Prayers with them, which *Pliny* speaks not of. But he should not have said this, till he answered the proof I brought in my 23d Page; that [Carmen] among the Romans signified, any solemn Form, and is often used for a Prayer; and till he had confuted the Observation I made, that *Pliny* doth not express it, that they sang, but said this [Carmen], which makes it probable it might be a Prayer; and we know the Christians used Prayers as well as Hymns to *Christ*. Moreover *Pliny* evidently describes all the Service by this word, and whatever it notes (Prayers or Praises) 'tis certain they were in Forms, because they said them alternately. And finally, if it do signifie Hymns, I gave many Reasons why the Prayers and the Hymns.

Hymns might be alike; All which to *pag. 25.* (though fit enough to be examined) Mr. S. B. wholly passeth by, which is to me a Confession, that he could give no reason why this Testimony should not be evidence for the use of Forms, both in their Prayers and Praises: He only catches at one Expression, *pag. 24.* and saith, *Pliny's account of the Christians doth not exactly agree with that of Eusebius, concerning the Essenes.* He singles out *Eusebius* only to cavil, whereas I did not name *Eusebius* here, but referred to the whole account given before of the *Essenes* (by *Josaphus*, *Philo*, and *Eusebius*) *pag. 20.* Where it appears, that those *Essenes* exactly agreed with *Pliny's* Christians, first, in the use of Forms; secondly, in using them alternately; and, thirdly, in using them early in the morning: This is all the agreement I mentioned, and all my Question obliged me to consider; for this still confirms the early use of Forms, and makes it probable those *Essenes* were Christians, who had used them even from the time of *S. Mark*.

S. 4. pag. 16. *Ignatius* testifies, that the Christians in their Assemblies had One Prayer, and one Supplication. Mr. S. B. saith, I take this for a solid proof of a fixed Liturgy: But I infer no more from this and another place, *pag. 26.* than, that it is probable from hence, there was then one Form of prayer and administering the Sacraments, approved by the Bishop. And this Consequence will be plain, if we consider, that *Ignatius* is speaking of public Prayer; and in that, would have the *Magnesian*s do nothing without the Bishop and Presbyters, and not to make trial of all things agreeing to their own fancy; (this Passage Mr. S. B. leaves out, because it censures Extempore Prayers) But when they met to pray, they must have all one Prayer, and one Supplication in common (so Mr. S. B.'s Edition reads it). Now then, The Prayer they were to use was allowed by the Bishop, and not such as agreed to private Ministers fancies; it was One Prayer and Supplication used by all in common; all which is the proper description of a Liturgy: Whereas an Extempore Prayer is so various, it cannot be approved; that agrees to private and single Ministers fancies; it is daily varied, and so not one; spoken by the Minister alone, and so not repeated by all in common: But a Form is properly one and the same Prayer.

Prayer. And so *S. Chrysostom*, when he describes the Priest and People vocally repeating the Form of Confession, useth this very phrase, *ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ὁμολογῶν* Hom. 18 in 2 *Cor.* They all repeat One Prayer. As to the Bishops approbation, the second Quotation makes that necessary to every Authentic celebration of the Eucharist and Baptism; and I know not how a Bishop can tell, whether he shall approve or disapprove of any Form of celebration made Extempore; he must see it written down before he can judge of it: So that here we have very fair evidence of Prayers, Litanies, and Sacramental Administrations, in Forms approved by the Bishop. Mr. S. B. would evade this by saying, *One Prayer implies no more, than a Prayer in which all joyned*: But if that were true, it might be a Form still, because the most apparent method for all to joyn in One prayer, is for all to pray by one Form; and they who come together daily to say a different prayer, rather joyn in several prayers, than in One; besides, *Ignatius* his One Prayer was not the product of private Fancies, it was some Fixed known thing, capable of being considered and approved by the Bishop; and the constant use of it, is made the mark of one who was in communion with his Bishop; that is, (in *S. Chrysostom's* sense) *One Form repeated in common between the Bishop or Priest, and the People*. I only add, that when Mr. S. B. took notice, that *Ignatius* would have all that live under an Orthodox and Sound Bishop, joyn in Communion with him, in the use of that Prayer and way of Administration which he approved, he had a fair occasion to have seen some Faults on the Dissenters side; who now cannot deny, but their Bishops are Orthodox, and yet separate from their Communion.

Page 17. I proved both by *Socrates* and *Photius*, that *Ignatius* first brought the way of singing Hymns by way of Antiphone into the Church of *Antioch*: *Valesius's* Notes on this passage enable Mr. S. B. to quarrel at this, and say, *That the Learned generally count this Relation of Socrates to be fabulous; and that Theodoret is positive, that Flavianus and Diodorus first brought in this way there*. I reply, He despises the Opinion of Learned men, when it is not on his side, See page 37: and here he appeals to it, but mistakes it; for it is the Vision of Angels (who taught *Ignatius* thus to sing, as *Socrates* saith) which some of the Learned

Learned count Fabulous; but divers Learned men think it very probable, that *Ignatius* might set up this way of Singing at *Antioch*: For *Moses*, by the Spirit of God, taught the *Israelites* to sing thus in the Wilderness, *Exod. xv.* Thus they sang in the Temple-service: The Choir of Angels in the Vision of *Isaiab*, sang by way of Antiphone, *Isai. vi.* So did the *Essenes* in *Philo*, and the *Asian* Christians in *Pliny*, before *Ignatius's* time; and can it be unlikely he should set up this way at *Antioch*? especially since *Flavianus* and *Diodorus* (as Mr. S. B. grants) had it from the *Syrians*, the old Inhabitants of that Country where *Antioch* stood. As for *Theodoret*, he speaks not of Hymns, but saith, *Flavianus* and *Diodorus* first brought in the alternate singing of *David's Psalms* at *Antioch*; which may be true, though *Ignatius* had begun to sing Hymns there by way of Antiphone long before: Nor am I so concerned for this proof, as my Examiner thinks; because, he may see I have sufficient Evidence without it, to shew, That Hymns were prescribed Forms, and sung alternately in this first Century. And he passes over in silence a plain Testimony of mine, pag. 28. proving, That Hymns were prescribed in Forms almost from the beginning of Christianity, and were so known as to be cited for good Authority in points of Faith in the next Century. Wherefore I have shewed, That in this Age wherein there were so many extraordinarily Inspired, they chose to use Forms both of Prayer and Praise; and if they who needed not Forms, used them of choice, as the best way of Worship; Our Age which needs them, may well enjoyn them.

The Second Century.

§. I. **F**ROM that Prayer which began with the Father, and ended with the Hymn of many Names, in *Lucian*, where he describes and derides a Christian Assembly; I inferred, That the Christians then had Prayers and Hymns known by their proper Titles; which implies, they used Forms in public. Mr. S. B. first questions, whether this were a Christian Assembly; and

and perhaps he is the first and only man that ever did question it. Mr. Mede cites this very place, to prove the Christians had Churches in *Lucian's* time; See his *Disc. of Churches*, Tom. 1. pag. 22. and the learned Notes of *Woorverus* and *Heraldus* on *Minutim Felix*, cite this Dialogue of *Lucian*, to prove the Christians of that Age were pale with Fasting; *Not. in Min. Fel.* pag. 109. *Lugd. Bat.* 1672. Secondly, The Examiner thinks *Lucian* here design'd to ridicule Pagan as well as Christian Religion. I reply, He begins the Dialogue with a Jocular representation of the Arguments used by Christians, against Swearing by the Heathen gods, with design only to render Christianity odious to the Pagans; but the latter part, (whence this passage is cited) is wholly taken up in a direct exposing of Christianity; witness his Jeer upon the Name of Christ, his mention of Catechumens, his Scoffing at the Doctrins of the Trinity, Providence, and a Future-state, with his intimating the Christians were a sort of Magicians: Yea, at last Mr. S. B. grants, *He might design this as a reflection on their way of praying to one person first, and then concluding as if they prayed to many; he should have said, praised many: For the end was, an Hymn of many Names.* And if this be *Lucian's* sense, That they had a Prayer beginning with the Father, and a Hymn in the conclusion, called *the Hymn of many Names*; then Christians used some certain Forms both of Prayer and Praise, which had certain beginnings and proper Titles, so as such as heard them might give them the Names by which they were commonly known: The Prayer had a certain beginning, and the Hymn (if it were not the *Trisagion*) must be in Form, as all Hymns generally were. As for his wonder, how a *Jeering Pagan* could be admitted to hear *the prayers, which were then concealed from Heathens*: It may be News to him, what *Suidas* and others say of *Lucian*, That he was a Christian, yea, a Preacher at Antioch before his Apostacy; and that enabled him to know all the Doctrin and Worship of the Christians. Though it is not improbable, that the Blasphemy and Railing of this and other Apostates, contributed to make them still more cautious to conceal their Mysteries, of which the next Age affords store of Evidence.

§.2. pag.19. I observed *Justin Martyr* shews some inclination this way; for though he write of the Christian Worship, yet he gives no account of the particular words used in celebrating it. The Examiner saith, *He doth not so much as say they had Forms.* I reply, I have proved by other Evidence they had Forms, and both Jews and Gentiles then worshiped God by Forms; so that his silence argues the Christians had not altered that point, whereas a new way would have needed some Apology. But he finds me in a great mistake about Baptism, the words of which (he saith) *Justin Martyr* relates, viz. *In the Name of the Father of all things, the Lord God, and of our Saviour Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.* But the mistake will prove on his side, for I saw these words; but I affirm they are not the very words by which they did Baptize, but a paraphrase on them (as the learned *Vossius* declares; See *Hist. Lit. par. 2. cb. 4. pag. 252.*) So that this description, as well as that cautious Expression, of *regenerating new Converts, as we were regenerated*; are intended to disguise the mysterious Form, which no sober man can imagine the Christians of this early and pure Age should alter so much from that which Jesus prescribed. And to confirm my Opinion, that *Justin Martyr* was for concealing the words of their worship, I observe that he saith, *The Catechumens were taught to pray.* Now they could not pray without a Form we may be sure, yet *Justin* doth not tell us what this Form was, though the practice of the next Ages assure us, it was the Lord's Prayer, which the Catechumens learned just before Baptism. Again, he doth not mention divers Ceremonies of the Eucharist and Baptism; such as the Kiss of Charity, repeating the Creed, renouncing the Devil, &c. though learned Men believe these were in use in his time; but he writ to Heathens, and would not give them an account of the particular Rites in Christian worship: And though his general Expressions and former Evidence make it out they used Forms then, yet I said I would not insist upon that general account he gives of their Supplications, though these Phrases are found in ancient Litanies. The modesty of this seems to offend him (who is very rarely guilty of offending on that side) and he asks, *Whether such things cannot be pray'd for, but in prescribed words?* and, *how it appears Justin M. borrowed this from any Litany?* A man would think he could expressly prove, these

E

things

things were then prayed for extempore, because he will not allow this for a probable Evidence: But impartial men will consider, there are other evidences of Forms in this Age, and *One Supplication* in *Ignatius*; as also that there were Litanies soon after, which were so old in the Fourth Century, as to pretend to be composed by the Apostles: Also in them, these very things are prayed for in Forms; viz. *The Conversion of the Jews, and the Deliverance of the Gentiles from their Errors, &c.* almost in *Justin* very words, who cites them here for a proof of the Christians Charity, in a dispute with a learned Jew, who would scarce have taken arbitrary, uncertain, or extempore Expressions for a solid proof of Christian usages: All this, I hope will pass with most men for a probable Evidence, That *Justin* did refer to a Form of Supplication.

Page 20. Again I expounded *Justin Martyr's* phrase of [*κοινὰς δέχας*] *Common-Forms* in which all might joyn, proving it by *S. Cyprian's* styling the Lords Prayer, in which all the Congregation vocally joyned, a *Common-Prayer*; and this I shewed agreed to *Ignatius* his *One Prayer and Supplication in common*. And to justify my Exposition, I now add, That *Justin M.* himself seems thus to explain it in the next page, where he saith, Ἀριστὸν πάντων κοινῇ πάντας καὶ ἐν ἑκαστῇ ψαλμῷ. *Apol. 2. pag. 98. We all rise, and in common send up our Prayers.* And *S. Chrysostom* accurately explains the Phrase, where he saith, Κοινὰ καὶ παρὰ τῷ ἱερεὶ, καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν γίνονται αἱ δέχαι. *Hom. 18. in 2 Cor. Common-Prayers are made between the Priest and People.* Mr. S. B. without any Evidence to support him, rejects this sense, and will have them called, *Common-Prayers, because* (as the next words import) *they extended to all Mankind*: But the very Reason he gives for his Explication, confutes it. The next words say, *They were made for all men*; and if *Common-Prayer* had signified the same thing, here had been a plain tautology, and *Justin* (as he expounds) must say, *They made Prayers for all men, praying for all men*: Wherefore as the latter words imply the subject of them was general; so the former [*κοινὰς δέχαι*] shew, they were common both to Priest and People, each having their known share, which can only be in the use of Forms; and this is the true sense of [*κοινὰς*] which the Criticks derive from [*κοινῇ*] and say it is, τὸ τοῖς πᾶσι κοινὸν. that which lies before all, and every one shares in.

Hence

Hence the Ancients Common Meal, of which all their Friends there assembled had a portion, was called [*Cena*]; wherefore this Phrase applied to Prayers, signifies, that the Congregation had a share in the Service, and shews they were Forms, for themselves, and for all others: And *Justin* would rather have called them, *General* or *Universal*, than *Common-Prayers*, if he had meant by that Epithet to signifie, they were made for all Men.

Pag. 21. But the most famous passage in *Justin M.* is that of the *Presidents offering up Prayers, and in like manner Thanksgivings* [*ὅν δυνάμει ὡπύ*] as well as he is able. Mr. *Clarkson* first produced this place to prove, that they used Extempore prayers then at the Eucharist, and spent near Ten pages in Quotations, to make out that to be the import of this Phrase. To this I made two general Replies; First, If this were the sense of *ὅν δυνάμει*, it would not follow from the Clergies praying so in the Inspired Ages, that we must pray so now. Secondly, That Mr. *Cl.* was hard put to it for proofs, when he laid so much stress on a Phrase that at least is very ambiguous. These two Replies Mr. *S.B.* takes no notice of. Thirdly, I answered all Mr. *Cl.*'s pertinent Quotations, and brought others to shew, that this Phrase signifies no more than praying and praising God with all possible fervency; the Examiner interposes to judge between us, and without enquiring into either of our Quotations, gives sentence against me, and his pretended Reasons for it are these: First, Because *Justin M.* for the understanding this Phrase, refers us (not to *ὑπόμνη*, as I affirmed, but) to *ἐν' αὐτῷ*, a little before, where he saith, *The President offers up prayers and praises to God, &c. and gives thanks for the benefits vouchsafed in the Lords Supper ἐν' αὐτῷ*, which (for any thing he yet knows) signifies, distinctly and with variety of Expression. I reply, This passage where [*ἐν' αὐτῷ*] is found, speaks only of giving thanks, he hath added [*Prayers*] of his own head. Secondly, *ἐν' αὐτῷ* signifies, for a long time, and not (as he fancies) distinctly or with variety of Expression, as appears by *Acts xxviii. 6.* where, when the Viper hung on *Paul's* Hand, the Barbarians expected [*ἐν' αὐτῷ*] for a long time, that he should have fallen down dead; but surely they did not expect this distinctly or with variety of Expression: So that *ἐν' αὐτῷ* cannot explain *ὅν δυνάμει*, in his Sense. But,

Thirdly, *Fervor*, is used of the prayers after Baptism, which no doubt were agreeable to those at the Eucharist, and (as I shewed) it signifies, they were made, *earnestly, devoutly, and affectionately*, which is the import of *bon Animo* in the prayers and praises at the Communion. So that still it appears, *Justin M.* by both these phrases intended to express the fervency of him that officiated, not his using new and various words.

Pag. 22. Again, Secondly, Mr. S. B. understands not, why its signifying *fervently* should exclude the other sense, of the *Presidents* using his ability, as to Expressions. It seems there are many things he doth not, and some he will not understand; I doubt the latter is the case here; for there is an obvious Reason, why this one phrase cannot signify both in this place, *viz.* because it is not usual for an Author in the same place, to use the same phrase in two so different senses; and I have shewed the most usual and probable sense is, *fervently*; and therefore Mr. C. must not build a new Notion, upon his new and false Exposition. As to the Examiner, he would make that sense necessary by a Case which he refers to me to decide, *viz.* Whether a Minister using a prescribed Form with all the fervency he can, may be said to pray as well as he is able, if he think he can represent his Resentments better by his own Expressions? Which Case I thus resolve; If the Form he use be our Liturgy, and he goes on still to use it, notwithstanding the spirit of Pride suggests to him great things of his own abilities, He prays better than he is able to do on the sudden, in his own Expressions: And I cannot believe any considering man of tolerable modesty, will say, that he is able to express the wants of a public Congregation better (especially without study) than they are expressed in our accurate Forms, drawn up by so many learned and pious Men, with great care and judgment, wherein all ordinary cases are provided for, and to which (when public Affairs require it) New occasional Forms are added in better Expressions, than most of us can put together by study and our utmost care: He therefore who prays fervently by such Forms, certainly prays as well as he is able.

Thirdly, He adviseth me, to look over my Quotations again, and see whether they mean no more than vigorous affections: Which is a fine way of covering his ill success in examining them. He never slips

flips any advantage; and from his silence I may conclude, he found none here; wherefore my proofs for this Sense stand good, till he offer something to invalidate them.

Page. 22. A further proof, that *ὁν δυνάμει* relates only to the Affections, is, because it is frequently applied to praises, which I have proved, generally were in Forms. And I justly taxed Mr. Cl. for applying the phrase only to Prayers, since in this and another place of *Justin*, it chiefly, if not only relates to the Hymns, &c. Mr. S. B. falsely cites my words, as if I said, It only related to the Hymns, &c. whereas I do think it relates to Prayers, but not only nor chiefly to them; because in the former place of *Justin M.* p. 60. it is joyned to *ἐκείνους, praising God as well as we are able*, and in the latter place, pag. 98. it immediately follows *ὁμολογίας, offering praises as well as we are able*: And so it doth also in three of those four places which I produced, pag. 36, 37. Wherefore *ὁν δυνάμει*, being so often applied to Praises, and chiefly relating to them, in these two places of *Justin M.* and they being for the most part in prescribed Forms, it must signifie something which is proper to those who praise God by a Form, that is (not making new Expressions, but) *fervency*: But if he will have it in *Justin M.* equally relate to Prayers, it is certain the Prayers and Praises were both alike; for he saith, *Εὐχαριστοῦμεν ὡς ὁμολογίας, &c.* pag. 98. *He offereth up Prayers, and in like manner Thanksgivings, &c.* So that if the Praises were Forms, the Prayers were so also. Now the Hymns at the Eucharist were one sort of praises, instituted by Christ, and surely not omitted by this pure Age, so near their first appointment; and these must be Forms; yet these among other Praises were offered up (*ὁν δυνάμει*) *Fervently*, but not with new Expressions. He objects, *There are other ways of praising God besides Hymns*: I grant it; but still the Hymns, which were not invented by the President, were offered up according to his ability; that is, *as fervently as he was able*. I grant also, there was a large Thanksgiving used at the Eucharist, but this was reduced to a written Form, when the Apostolical Constitutions were writ; and the Form was so old then, that it was pretended to be made by the Apostles, and so might be a Form in *Justin's* time. As to his Objection, *That Justin speaks of no audible concurrence of the people in these Offices, but only by saying, Amen.* I reply, Suppose he did not, yet a Negative Argument

ment from the silence of one Author, is like an induction of one particular, it proves nothing; since other Writers of this Age do testify, that the Praises were made by Forms: And yet I have shewed from the former place of *Justin Martyr*, pag. 60. (in my 35th page) *That the whole Congregation of Christian people did praise God in their Oblations (τον Ευχαριστιαν) as well as they were able: Therefore that Phrase doth signifie something that the People cando as well as the Priest, which is praising God fervently, and not by new Expressions.*

Pag. 24. And this leads me to my next Argument, why this Phrase must not be interpreted of *new Expressions*, but *Fervency*: because in the parallel place of *Justin*, in *Ecclesiasticus* xliii. 30. in two places of *Origen*, and one of *Nazianzen*, (τον Ευχαριστιαν) or something of the same import is applied to the People, who (as my Adversaries grant) are not allowed in public to pray or praise God in expressions of their own. Mr. S. B. drops all the proofs of this (according to his usual way) and not being able solidly to answer the Argument, he runs out into his old excursion, *That the dispute is about him that officiates*, and to talk of the *Ministers and Peoples distinct Duties in public*. This I answered before, upon pag. 11th, and am not at leisure to repeat so often as he sees fit to say the same things; therefore I will only say here, That Mr. C. and S. B. expound τον Ευχαριστιαν in a sense which makes it impossible to be applied to the People, and which makes it improper to be said of any but him that officiates, that is, they make it signifie *making the best new Expressions he was able*; which signification I do sufficiently disprove, when I shew that in *Justin* and other Authors, this phrase is attributed to the whole Congregation, and therefore it must signifie something which the people do, as well as the Priest, that is, it must signifie *Fervency*, and refer to the affections, not to the invention of new words and phrases. As for Mr. C.'s numerous Quotations I answered all that related to Prayers and Praises in public; but did not think fit to trouble the Reader or my self, to answer his Instances, where this or a like Phrase was applied to other Subjects, such as Writing, Preaching, or private Devotion, as those of *S. Chrysostom*, p. 119. and *S. Basil*, p. 120. And I think it not very modest in him (who hath scarce answered one of my collateral proofs) to triumph over

over me for omitting such Quotations as were not to the purpose; in the mean time, I hope I have satisfied all that are unprejudiced, that *ὅτι πάμυς*, when it is applied to public Offices, signifies *Fervently*, and that it can be no foundation for arbitrary, and extempore praying and praising God, especially when they have nothing in this Age, but this and another phrase to support so odd an Exposition.

§.3. pag.25. I cited *οἱ τῶς αἰῶνος ἢ αἰῶν* · *World without end*, out of *Irenæus*, to prove they had Hymns then in Form, and supposed this was the conclusion of the *Gloria Patri*. Mr. S. B. understands not how this was a *stinted Liturgy*. Very right! But he knows I brought it not to prove a whole Liturgy, but limited it for a proof of one Hymn; and therefore he is unjust, to put in more into the Conclusion than I did, and from thence to invalidate my Argument. Upon which occasion I would ask three Questions: First, Whether he or Mr. Cl. have brought so express a proof as this, that any single part of the Service was Extempore? Secondly, Whether the proof of any one Primitive Form, known and used so early (as this which is mentioned also in *Clem. ep. ad Cor. pag. 98, & 104.*) doth not prove it ancient and lawful to use prescribed Words in public Worship? Thirdly, What reason can be given, why other parts of the Service might not be in Form, as well as this? But still Mr. S. B. cannot apprehend how this proves the *Gloria Patri*, unless no Doxology but that can end with these words. His Apprehension would have been quicker, if this had been a seeming proof of Mr. Cl's side; but let it be considered by unbiaſſed persons, That if these words be the conclusion of any other Form, it serves my purpose as well, as if they concluded the *Gloria Patri*: And it is evident they were the certain and constant Conclusion of some Form, because the Hereticks urge them, and the Orthodox own them as usually said in their *Eucharist*. They could not have charged, nor would these have confessed an uncertain arbitrary phrase; nor could *Clemens*, *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian* have agreed in it, if some of them sometimes only had used it: And since we can prove, the *Gloria Patri* to be an Hymn as early as this Age, and *Tertullian* notes, that these words, *World without end*, were then (as they also are now) repeated by the People; I hope it is probable
at

at least, that this was a part of the *Gloria Patri*. To conclude, This way of Arguing is further from an imitation of the Hereticks in *Irenaus*, (as he suggests) than his pretending my Evidence for one Form was intended to prove a whole Liturgy is from mean Sophistry.

§.4. Pag. 26. When *Clemens of Alexandria* saith, *The Christians prayed as having one common Voice, and one mind*; Strom. 7. he plainly alludes to that of the Apostle, Rom. xv. 6. of *Glorifying God with one mind and one mouth*: Wherefore I expounded *Clemens*, as *Grotius* doth the Apostle, That *One common Voice*, intimates, *their joyning Voices in responsory Forms*; Mr. Cl. and Mr. S. B. will have *this One common Voice*, to be that of the Minister, who speaks instead of all the People; they mean in their New-fashioned Assemblies, where (contrary to the Ancients) the Congregation is wholly silent, and make no Responses. But my account is not only agreeable to Antiquity, where I have proved both by Scripture and Fathers, alternate and responsory praises and prayers were used: But also this very Phrase proves, That the People joyned vocally in the public Worship, which could not be without Forms. Thus the *Israelites* Promise, to keep Gods Law, is expressed (*Exod. xix. 3.*) by their Saying *this all together*; and *Exod. xxiv. 3.* *They answered it with one voice*. Baals Prophets did not choose one Foreman to speak for them, when they all with one mouth prophesied good to Ahab, 1 *King. xlii. 35*. Nor had the mutinous *Ephesians* one Spokesman, when they cried out so long together *with one voice*, *Act. xix. 34*. but each man vocally joyned with the rest. Thus when the Singers, and those who played on Musical Instruments, united their Notes to praise God, they are said to make *One sound*, 2 *Chron. v. 13*. or as the LXX read it, *ὁ ἕνα φωνή*, *They made one Voice*——ἐν τῷ ἀγαπᾶν φωνή μίαν, &c. while they answered each other in singing, with one voice, their confession and praise to God: And S. Basil expressly uses the phrase in this Sense, where he saith, Πάντες κατὰ ὅς ἐξ ἑοῦ σέμαλ, ὁ μὲν καρδίας τὴν ἰδεολογίαν ὑμῶν ἀνατίπτει· ἰδέα ἑαυτοῦ ἕκαστος τὰ ῥήματα ἡ ψαλμοῦ ποιῶν· Basil. Epist. 63. They all in common, as with one mouth and one heart, offer up the Psalm of Confession; every one making these penitential Words to be his own. This Psalm probably

probably was the L.L. however certainly it was a Form repeated vocally by Priest and People; and this is the true Notion of a Common-prayer, and a Prayer *with one Mouth*. Having thus justified my Exposition, I need not stand upon his petty Objections, *viz.* 1st *If the People answered, there would not be one, but two Voices.* Ple grant, if he please, sometimes there were Two thousand Voices; yet if they all repeated the same Form, or all joyned by Turns to carry on the same Common-service (as in responsory Prayers and alternâte Hymns) it is very proper to say, All these have one Voice, and glorifie God with one Mouth. 2^{ly}, He notes, *That S. Paul saith expressly, With one Mouth, Rom. xv. but Clemens's words are, As it were with one mouth or voice.* I reply, The Father only designs to soften the Apostles Expression, because when many vocally joyn in public Forms, they have not strictly one Voice; but *as it were one Voice*. Yet we see the phrase of *One voice*, is properly and often applied, to many joyning in the same words: But *Clemens's* phrase, and *S. Basils, As it were with one mouth*, can never be properly applied to the Extempore man, who is absolutely, and throughout, the only Mouth of his silent Auditors.

Pag. 28. It is no fault in Mr. Cl. to have nothing but Conjectures for his Opinion, in this and the following Ages; but he wonders *I should insist upon Conjectures.* I gave divers Reasons, why we must expect little more than probable Proofs in this time; and supported my Conjectures with Arguments. Mr. S.B. touches not either the Reasons or Arguments, but censures my way of proceeding: He doth not deny that the Christians imitated the Jews in the Hours of Prayer; and I have proved by many Authors, that they imitated them in alternâte Singing and Praying by Forms; so that though it be but a Conjecture from *Clemens* attesting they used the Jewish Hours of Prayer, to infer a probability of their imitating them in Forms; yet the thing is plainly proved elsewhere, and so he ought not to expose this Notion, *as all over Conjecture, and one Doctor's Opinion*, especially since he cannot confute it, but by saying, *If the Christians of that Age were of another Opinion, what becomes of my Argument?* I am sure this is meer Conjecture: Let him bring as many Proofs, that these early Christians were for Extempore prayers and praises, as I have done

for Forms, and then he shall have leave sometimes to suppose it; till then his [*If*] is an evasion, no answer. As to the place I alledged out of *Clemens*, which shews the Method of the Christians Prayers, and the main things they pray'd for; He is right as to the Quotation, but mistaken in saying, I applied it to public Prayer; neither I nor *Clemens* limited it either to public or private Prayer: If he please, I will suppose this place refers to private Prayers; and then I must ask, how *Clemens* could know so well, and so exactly describe the method and matter of mens private Prayers, if they were not in Forms? and if they used Forms in private, 'tis more than probable they used them in public also. Mr. S. B. concludes with diverting his Friend, *By my dextrous device* (as he calls it) *of mens looking up to Heaven, while they use the Common Prayer.* Now in this there is no device at all, it is plain matter of Fact, which I have done and seen a Thousand times, it being as common for such as prayed by our Liturgy, to look frequently up to Heaven in imitation of the primitive Christians, as it is for Mr. S. B's Friends to wink, when they pray Extempore; and if he could prove they looked up to Heaven, while their Eyes were shut, that would be a dextrous device indeed.

§. 5. Pag. 30. *Tertullian* is my next Witness; and he first, speaking of the Lords Prayer, calls it, *A new Form of Prayer which Christ had given his Disciples*; which Mr. Cl. did not deny: But the Conformist (to shew himself a greater Enemy to Forms than Mr. Cl.) boldly asserts, that *Tertullian* means by *Novam formam*, only *A new direction how to perform the Duty of Prayer*: But his manifest perverting that Fathers Sense, appears by considering, That in this Tract *Tertullian* is expounding the very words of Christs Form; and immediately after he had described it by *the new Form he gave to his Disciples*, he parallels it with, and prefers it before the Form which *John* taught his Scholars: And doth he think, *John's* was only a Directory? Did not Christ and S. *John* both teach their Disciples a Form? yea, doth not *Tertullian* there observe, that the very words of our Saviours Prayer were extant, but *John's* were not? Nothing can be plainer, than that he means the Lords Prayer by this *New Form*, and that the Christians then used it

as a Form; for he introduces the words to be expounded thus, *We say, Our Father, &c. we request, his Name may be hallowed*——not saying, *let it be hallowed in us* (they varied not a word): Then he also saith, *We add, Let thy Will be done, &c.* And after his Comment is finished, which so fully declares they used those very words, he is as clear, that they joyned it to their other Prayers; for he observes, *Christ allows us to ask other things, after he had premised the legal and ordinary Prayer as a foundation*: This is the Lords Prayer, which Christs Law enjoyns, and Christians ordinarily or daily used, making that the Foundation on which they built up their other Requests in their Liturgies, and it is most likely the Superstructure was suitable to the Foundation, that is, a Form at least. I confess, *Tertullian* doth by way of Preface, before he expounds the Form, and as a conclusion after it, touch upon some Passages in *Matb. VI* concerning the manner of using this Form; but the new Form, the legitimate and ordinary Prayer, which they said daily, signifie the Lords Prayer it self; and so may those phrases also, *viz. Orandi disciplina, & ordinata religio Orationis*; yet if he will expound them of the Directions about Prayer, it will not hurt my Cause, since there is sufficient evidence, that the Lords Prayer was called a Form, and used as such in *Tertullian's* time.

Pag. 31. I next observed *Tertullian's* Saying, *The Christians set upon God in prayer with a grateful violence (quasi manu facta), as if they were drawn up to battel*; and inferred from thence, *That it seems to intimate their use of Forms.* Mr. S. B. is confident the phrase implies no more, than *joyning in heart with him that officiates.* I reply, *Manus conserere* in *Ovid*, is to *joyn battel*, wherein all hands are employed; and if the phrase be applied to Prayer, it notes every ones bearing a part in his own rank. No man can properly say, the two Armies of *Israelites* and *Philistins* joyned battel, when they stood looking on their Champions, *David* and *Goliath*, though they joyned in heart with them, and each party wished success to their own Friend: And when *Tertullian* describes the Christians going in a Body to their Persecutors, and every one of them declaring he would die for his Religion, they are said to go, *quasi manu facta; ad Scap. cap. ult.* Wherefore this phrase imports vocal joyning in prayers. * Again, it may pass as a probable proof of an *African*

Litany, that *Tertullian* appeals to the Petitions usually made for the Emperors safety, and the good of the State, to prove the Christians Loyalty: For various and arbitrary Expressions, daily differing, are no good evidence: And though *Tertullian* writing to Infidels, might not use the very words, yet he comes so near the Petitions on the like occasion, found in ancient Liturgies (one of which was so old, *An. 360.* (viz. that in the *Constitutions*) as to challenge an Apostolical Original) that it is probable enough there was an *African* Form in this Age, to which *Tertullian* alludes.

Page 32. The passage out of *Tert. de anima, cap. 9.* was that, where he calls the celebration of the Eucharist, *Dominica Solennia*; Mr. Cl. denies that these words intimate the Office was performed by a Form. I thought I had sufficiently answered him, by proving that the Latins used, *Solennes preces*, for *invariable Forms*, as *Brissotius* tells us, whose learned Commentary of the Romans solemn Forms, declare he was a very fit Judge of the import of this word. Mr. S. B. gives no reply to this, but falsely asserts, That I said not one word to Mr. Cl's vindication of this place; whereas I said more to it pag. 44. than he can answer; yet I shall now add, that though Scripture was read, Psalms sung, Sermons made, and Petitions delegated, in the Assembly where the Christians met, yet the Virgin spoke of in *Tertullian*, only took the matter of her Visions from thence; but her Raptures were after these were done, *inter Dominica solennia, At the Feast of our Lord, the Eucharist*, the last of all the public Offices, after which always followed, the dismissal of the People, as *Tertullian* here tells us, *Transacta solennia dimissa plebe*: So that Mr. Cl. is mistaken in applying *Dominica solennia* to the Reading, Singing, and other Offices which went before: For these words only denote the Eucharist, as they do also in *S. Cyprian*, who useth *Solennibus adimpletis* for the Solemn prayer of Consecration. And I must note further, that *Tertullian* often useth *Solennia*, for Festivals of all sorts; *Pagan, Apol. c. 35. ad ux. l. 2. c. 6.* Jewish, *ad ux. cap. 4.* & Christian, *de Idol. cap. 14.* and so it is properly enough applied to the great Christian Feast of the Lords Supper: But the reason why *Solennia* is used for Festivals, seems to be, because the time and solemn Rites of them were all prescribed, and from thence Solemn prayers, or Verses, came to signify, *stated, fixed, and prescribed*

scribed Forms, according to *Briffonius* : Wherefore *Solemnia*, both in *Tertullian* and *S. Cyprian* do import the use of *solemn and prescribed words* in the *solemn Feast of the Lords Supper* : And it is plain from *Tertullian*, they used the *Form prescribed by Christ himself in Baptism*, the other Sacrament, as appears by *Mr. Cl.* who cites these words of *Tertullian, de Bap. cap. 13.* in his *Disc. of Lit.* pag. 94. to prove the ancients thought, *the Form of Baptizing was prescribed by Divine Authority*; but *Mr. S. B.* outfaces *Tertullian*, and *Mr. Cl.* as well as me, and affirms, *that forma prescripta doth not signifie a prescribed Form, but only the manner in which Baptism is to be administred.* Let the Reader consult the place, and he will be amazed to see this Father so wilfully perverted to serve a Turn : For *Tertullian* sets down the words of the Form, viz. *In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, cites the Gospel and saith, *this Form is prescribed there.* Yet his Exposition is not more false, than his Inference is disingenuous : He knows I brought this only to prove, one part of the Liturgy was a Form; yet he bids his Friend try his faculty, if he can draw a conclusion from hence, for the use of such a Liturgy as we are discoursing of. This is the old *Cramben his coftam*, the dull Fallacy so often used before : 'Tis plain, Liturgies consist of divers parts, and some of my Proofs shew the Prayers, some the Praises, some the Sacramental Administrations were in Forms; every one of these Proofs are fit to be inserted in a History of Liturgy, although the general conclusion doth not arise from that single proof, but from an induction of all the particulars : So that if he, or his Friend, will be trying their Faculties, they may do it by shewing, *That all my Proofs put together, do not make out a prescribed Liturgy; or, that a proof brought for one part, doth not make out that part was a Form.*

Pag. 33. I cannot wonder that he who can deny, that *Forma prescripta*, is a *prescribed Form*, should say, that *my Instance out of Tert. ad ux. l. 2.* is not to our present purpose, because it only concerns *Singing* : But are not *Psalms and Hymns* which are sung, one main part of Liturgy? he may as well affirm, that to discourse of the Veins and Arteries, is nothing to the purpose of an Anatomy-Lecture : The laudatory part was at least one half of the Service, and that being alternate, was certainly in Forms; and the Prayers, will be thought Forms also, till he can give

a good reason, why one part of their Offices should be different from the other, or why they might not pray as well as sing by Forms: But he saith, *This passage relates to Singing in the Family.* Suppose it do; yet if the Husband and Wife sang alternately, that is, by a Form; it is very likely they did sing by Forms in public, where so many were to joyn in the same Psalm or Hymn, that the words must be known before. He is in too much haste for an Examiner, otherwise he would not have asked, how (*eis αἰῶνας*) comes to be a proof of Liturgies, (he should have said, of one Form of Praise) If he will stay for my answer, I will tell him: *Tertullian* proves, That Christians must not go to Pagan shows, because of the indecency of using the same words and actions, in a vain Theatre, and at the Church; *to clap those hands, as a Stage-player, which had been lifted up to God in prayer; to give testimony to a Gladiator with that mouth, which had pronounced Amen in the Sacrament; to say World without end [*eis αἰῶνας αἰῶνος*], so 'tis in the best Copies]* de spect. p. 83. Here is a plain comparison between Words and Actions to be used in the Church, and in the Theatre, by persons who went to both places; they clapped and lifted up the same hands, they shouted and said *Amen* with the same mouth, to very different objects, and on occasions that did no way agree. In the Theatre they said, in a solemn Form of acclamation, *World without end*, to a mortal, yea, to a wicked man, that is, to *Commodus* the Emperor; (for *Xiphiline* notes, the Romans a little before this had used those words in a solemn Exclamation to *Commodus*, Epist. Dion. in Corn. p. 383.) But in the Church, these very words were in a Form of praise to God and Christ (as out of *Irenæus* and *Clemens Romanus* I noted before) wherefore it would be little less than Blasphemy, to apply the words of a Christian Hymn, proper to an Eternal Being, unto a lewd mortal Man. Thus *Tertullian* argues, and if his Comparison be truly made, as it was a Form used by all the people at the Theatre; so it must be in some Form which the People repeated at Church, that is, probably in the *Gloria Patri*, because it still stands in that part of this Hymn which the People say; but it serves my purpose as well (since it must be a Form said by the People) as if it were the end of any other Hymn. But he wonders *that the Africans, who belonged to the Latin Church, should say the Gloria Patri in Greek*: Whereas it doth not follow from
Ter-

Tertullian, that they said it in Greek; his Argument is as good if they had said it in Latin: Only the Romans used many solemn Forms in Greek both in their Theatres and their Temples, and *Xiphiline* sets down this in Greek; so that probably *Tertullian* refers to that passage in the Historian, and only means it was used in Greek in the Theatre. He might also read it in Greek in *Clemens Romanus*, and in *Irenæus*, and so cite it in Greek; but that will no more prove the *African* Service was in Greek, than that the *Roman* or *Gallican* Churches used to say it in Greek, in *Clemens* or *Irenæus* times. Only from this and many other Greek words left uninterpreted in *Tertullian*, and other *African* Fathers, we may be sure the *African* People knew some Greek, especially short and common Forms and Phrases.

Pag. 34. Mr. Cl. had produced three places of *Tertullian*, to justify the Extempore way; all which I answered. For the two first, Mr. S. B. refers the Reader to Mr. Cl. because I said so little concerning them; though I said so much indeed, that he is not able to answer it, nor clear Mr. Cl. who is evidently mistaken in referring, that *Singing*, which was used after the Love-feast, to the Christians public Devotions. 'Tis known, that they were always fasting till after their Morning solemn Service, of which this Singing could be no part, because it was after the Common Meal: Secondly, I shewed there is nothing in *Tertullian* which hinders us from believing, that the Hymns made *de proprio ingenio*, were composed at home; and if so, then they were Forms, as well as those taken out of Scripture: Thirdly, The use of private Compositions in an Inspired Age, will not justify the use of them now. As to the second place, I proved expressly out of *Tertullian* and *S. Cyprian*, that the Christians did often look down in Prayer, and so shewed Mr. Cl. was mistaken, when from their constant looking up to Heaven in prayer, he argued they used no Books to pray by: Which I think is as full an Answer to Mr. Cl. as can be desired; And the true Reason why Mr. S. B. doth examine nothing of all this, is, because he could find no evasion.

Pag. 35. But Mr. Cl.'s main proof for Extempore Prayer, is, Thirdly, from *Tertullian's* saying, they prayed *de pectore*; which phrase I shewed in four pages, was capable of several more proper Interpretations. Mr. S. B. replies not to any of these Proofs; but diverts his Reader, by telling him what he conceives and apprehends.

apprehends to be Tertullian's meaning: First, He refers to a place of S. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 8. where though the Apostles first words, *Lifting up holy hands*, may explain *Manibus expansis*, &c. yet how, without wrath and doubting, should expound Tertullian's praying, *Bare-head, and without a Monitor*, I cannot imagine. Secondly, He would explain this place, by another in the same Author a few Lines after, which speaks of a Prayer proceeding from *a chaste Body, an innocent Soul, and from the Holy Spirit*: Yet here again, *a chaste Body and an innocent Soul*, doth not explain praying with *Lifted-up hands, and a Bare-head*; and none but the worst of Enthusiasts will pretend, that a Prayer out of our own Breast, is the same with one proceeding from the Holy Spirit. Besides, if his bad Edition do not mislead him, he is much to blame in reading and pointing this place; — *maiores hostiam, quam ipse mandavit, orationem de carne pudicā, &c.* which makes the sense or non-sense to lie, that the good Christian offers a greater Sacrifice than God hath commanded — But the true reading is, *Ei offero opimam & maiorem hostiam, quam ipse mandavit orationem, de carne pudicā, de animā innocentē, de Spiritu Sancto profectam*, Apol. c. 30. He speaks here of the Lords Prayer, the very same Prayer which Christ commanded, which was a greater and better Sacrifice than any that the Heathen offered, when it was offered up with a chaste Body, a holy Soul, and those devout affections which are excited by the holy Ghost. Now let him try his faculty, how the purity, innocence, and devotion of Christians saying the Lords Prayer (a Form, commanded by Christ) can prove, that praying out of the breast (in praying for the Emperors in the former place) signifies Praying extempore, as he and Mr. Cl. pretend. I will only add to my former Exposition (that the Breast signifies the Memory) these Notes: A Monitor is properly to help memory, but the Christians who could say their Forms by heart, or out of their breast, needed no Monitor, as the Pagans did in reciting their Forms: So of a person fixed in the Memory, *Persius*, Sat. 5. saith — *sinuoso in pectore fixi*; And *Socrates* clearly uses Tertullian's Phrase in this sense, where he saith, *Theodosius could repeat the Holy Scriptures* [*ἀπο' ἐκείνης*] *out of his Breast*; or as the Latin Version hath it, *Memoriter pronuntiavit*, He could repeat them by Heart, or out of his Memory. When Mr. S. B. can bring so good Evidence, that *de pectore* signifies *Extempore*, it will then be time enough, to say more to that feigned

feigned Exposition; in the mean while I shall conclude, that this Phrase is no ground for *Extempore Prayer*; no, not in this Second Century, wherein there were miraculous Gifts, and probably that of Prayer.

The Third Century.

§.1. pag. 36. **I** Entred on this Age with the Reasons, why we could not expect any full Evidence, of the very words used in their Liturgies during this Period, *Hist. Lit. p. 51, &c.* Mr. S. B. passes by these three pages, because it was not easie to confute this Account, and because the bare mention of my declaring this, had spoiled his main Fallacy, of my undertaking to produce expresse proof of a perfect Liturgy, invariably used in these early Times.

My first Author, *Hippolitus*, he confesseth, *he hath never read*; yet he attempts to correct my Exposition of those words of the Martyr, *When Antichrist shall come, Liturgy shall be extinguished, Singing of Psalms shall cease, and reading of Scripture shall not be heard*; which he expounds as importing no more than, *that Antichrist would suppress the public, pure Worship of God*. But it might have been more probable that was celebrated by a common Form, if I had produced any proof before that *Alexysius* had born this sense. I reply, I have proved out of *Clemens Romanus*, that *Liturgy* is put for a prescribed Form of Divine Service. Yet if this were the first Author who used the word in this sense, his Testimony is not to be rejected, especially since there are good Reasons to convince us, that *Alexysius* here doth signifie a *Form of public Prayer*: For though this word sometime signifie the whole Service, yet here it is put for one essential part of it. *S. Aug.* rightly divides the public Worship into three parts, Prayer, Praise, and Reading Holy Scripture; *de Civ. Dei, l. 2 c. 28.* and when Liturgy is joyned with Plains and Readings it can signifie nothing but Prayer; and the use of the word, before and since, shews that Prayers were *by a prescribed Form*, and the word (*Extinguished*) confirms this Sense; for written

Forms may be, and actually were extinguished by Persecutors, as I shewed, *Par. 2. pag. 217, &c.* Mr. S. B. saith, *Antichrist may suppress the public exercise of Ministers gifts, as well as the use of Forms.* I reply, the word is not [*Suppress*] but [*Extinguish*] which cannot be applied to Ministers gifts, for they are not extinguished by a prohibition to use them; the Extempore man retains his faculty, and for all the Prohibition, is ready on the sudden to exercise it in any place: He adds, *That he doth not remember Antichrist has shewed any dislike of Forms.* Now this it is to expound an Author he never read: *Hippolitus's* Notion of Antichrist is, That it should be a Jewish Deceiver, who should labour to extinguish Christian Liturgy: But Mr. S. B. dreams all this while of the Pope, who he thinks the only Antichrist, and so, poor man, guesses at random and quite mistakes this Fathers meaning. Yet I can tell him of two Emiffaries of his Roman Antichrist, *Comin* and *Heath*, who first set up the Extempore way in *England*, and were as professed Enemies to Forms, and to our Liturgy, as any of our Dissenters are at this day; See *Foxes* and *Firebrands*, pag. 7, & 17.

S. 2. pag. 37. My first proof out of *Origen* is so plain, that it convinced the learned Centuriators, *That set-Forms were certainly used in his time:* The Examiner intimates, *That the Conviction of these Learned men is nothing to the matter in debate, but whether it be a substantial proof.* Very modest! But I pray, whether are these Historians, who had read and digested all the Records of that Age, or Mr. S. B. and his Friend, better Judges what is a substantial proof? And what have Mr. Cl. and the Examiner, to prove it no solid Proof? They both suggest (without any Evidence) *That this Passage might be added by Origen's Translators, because these Homilies are in Latin only.* But still this is but a possibility, and the contrary (as I shewed) is more probable, because the Matter of the Prayer is pure and grounded on Scripture, being more suitable to *Origen's* own Time and Notions, than to the Age and Opinions of his Translators, one of the latest of which (as I noted) was *Ruffinus*, and if he had put in this Form of Prayer, it had proved the use of Forms long before Mr. Cl.'s fixed Period. And here I must note the dissingenuity of Mr. *Clarkson*, who frequently cites places out of these Latin

Latin Homilies as good Evidence on his side, *Disc. of Lit.* p. 56, 105, 121, & 140; but when we cite them against him, he flies to this poor refuge, of Supposing this might be added by the Translators: But it will be always a rule in Equity, *That the Witness we produce for us, is good Evidence against us*, and Mr. S. B. will get no credit by vamping up this baffled Objection; nor by Mr. C.'s other weak pretence, That this Passage imports no more, than the preferring one or two Petitions in the same words, which is common with them that pray Extempore: For Origen's words are not, *We do ordinarily pray* (as he falsely translates them, pag. 39.) nor, *We say sometimes*, or to this effect; but, *We frequently say in the Prayer* (which is Origen's phrase when he cites any thing out of the Liturgy, as I shall shew on pag. 41.) and then he sets down the very Form, *O Almighty God, grant us a part with the Prophets, &c.* wherefore this was a known Form of prayer frequently used by the People, and that made it so necessary for Origen to expound it to them. Besides, Mr. S. B. p. 39. saith, *The People used frequently to say, Lord, give us a part, &c.* Now, I would know, *Whether they prayed Extempore in public?* He formerly affirms they were not called to this; yet here being pinched, he contradicts himself, and will have these words which the People used, to imply no more than what may be done by those who pray Extempore. As for his pretence, That the People said these words in the time of the Discourses or Homily, that contradicts Origen, who affirms, *It was said in the Prayer*——therefore not in the Sermon. Finally, Mr. S. B. saith, *If the matter be well enquired into, Origen's Explication is a reproof of the Prayer it self, and it may be questioned, whether we may pray for what he saith those Petitions import.* And why did not the Examiner *ex officio* enquire well into it, especially since I had proved the Prayer was Orthodox? Again, If Origen reprove the Prayer it self, then it was a Prayer in Origen's time, and not added by his Translators: But if Mr. S. B. dislike Origen's Explication of this Prayer, because he thinks it imports a desire to suffer as the Prophets did; 'tis a sign he knows little of Origen, who thirsted earnestly after Martyrdom, and so was likely enough to give it this Sense; and it is nothing to my purpose, whether that be the true sense or no, since I have sufficiently proved it was a known Form of Prayer.

Pag. 40. I had proved by Scripture, and other Authors, that [*προσκαλεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν*] in Origen, lib 6. in *Cels.* signifies, *Prescribed Forms of Prayer*. Mr.S.B. without examining my Evidence pronounces Sentence, viz. that *it means no more than praying according to the Rules God hath given for performing this Duty*; for that is to be the meaning (right or wrong) of any Phrase that seems to countenance Forms: But he runs into that mistake which I had noted in Mr.Cl. that is, he considers not, that Origen is not speaking of the manner of praying, but of the Prayers themselves, *They used prescribed or enjoined Prayers*. At last he dreams of a Directory in Origen's days, which he calls, *an Order for the method of performing Prayer without prescribing the words*; but if he impartially examine my Instances, he will find they signify more than so; and I add now, that *ἐκτάξει διηγεῖσθαι*, (a word of the same import) Luke I. 1. signifies to write down an History, and not barely to contrive a method by which others might compose it, in their own words. As to the last words of this Quotation, *That such as use these enjoined Prayers, cannot be overcome by Magicians or Devils*, Mr.Cl. left them out as well as I (*Disc. of Lit. p. 140.*) both of us judging them nothing to our Question, which is not about the effect of these Prayers, but about their being Forms: And now, how scandalous is Mr.S.B.'s partiality? If it be a fault to omit them, why are we not both blamed; if it be none, why doth he blame me? I perceive he fancies, *the Devil is more afraid of an Extempore Prayer, than a Form*: But he forgets that Christ put, *Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil*, into his Form, to secure us against the Devil and his Instruments. The Devil hath often been afraid of our Lords Form; but that he dreads not an Extempore Prayer, appears from Conjurers and Witches, who actually dealt with the Devil, and yet were admired for this kind of praying (*Hist. Lit. par. 2. pag. 278.*) Finally, He that is so unhappy in expounding Origen's Writings, is very unfit to tell us *what he thought*; he himself admires Extempore Prayer, and thence concludes, *Origen doted on it also*; but the Centuriators (who knew Origen's Sense better than he or Mr.Cl.) declare expressly, there were Forms in Origen's time.

Lastly,

Lastly, The full proof I brought, that Mr. Cl. was grossly mistaken in pretending, that *Origen* cited those passages out of the Psalter, which he brings in with this Preface, *We find — we say — in the Prayer* (as he did the Collect, pag. 37.) would have silenced any man but Mr. S.B. who takes no notice, that I proved *Origen* cited many other passages out of the Psalms directly, without this Preface; that these were Sentences proper for Liturgies; and that the Offices at *Alexandria* (well known to *Origen*) were taken chiefly out of the Psalms: And though he can make no reply to this Evidence, that he may not seem wholly silent, he First flies to his old shift, and calls for an antecedent proof of Liturgies. Now, had I brought none before, the citing whole Sentences as known and certain parts of a Liturgy commonly used, is a good proof if it were the first: But I have brought divers before, which want nothing to make them authentic, but his allowance, which he resolves never to grant, and then hopes he is safe. Secondly, When he had stated the case wrong, and kept all that makes for me, secret; he appeals to his partial and misinformed Friend: But if that Friend will consider, that *Origen* doth cite many passages out of the Psalter, and other places (which are also in the Psalter) expressly out of the Prayer, and refers to known words said and used in Prayer; he shall then have liberty to judge, whether there were not divers Forms taken out of the Psalms, and used in the Prayers, to which *Origen* doth refer in plain words. There is another clear confutation of Mr. Cl's Exposition of *Origen's* Homily on Numb. xi. and a further confirmation of my Opinion, that *Sanctus* signifies no more than *Fervently*, pag. 63, & 64. both which Mr. S.B. passes over in silence.

§. 3. pag. 41, &c. That there were Forms of Prayer used in *S. Cyprian's* time, I inferred first from his allowing the use of the Lords Prayer as a Form, and his owning the repeating of the very words of it. The Examiner first saith, *If this be supposed, it will not amount to a proof of Liturgies in our Sense.* I answer, If he grant this, it proves praying by a Form lawful and ancient, instituted by Christ, and continued to be used in public; yea, repeated by the People among the primitive Christians; it proves one main part of the public Service was an
invariable

invariable Form, and such a part as was to be the pattern of all other prayers, which must be Forms also, if they exactly imitated this Divine Exemplar; the prospect of which Consequences make *Mr. S. B.* fly off again from his concession, and labour for two whole pages to prove, that *S. Cyprian* doth not intimate the use of those words, but only, our following the directions which Christ had given for the manner of performing the duty of Prayer. But the bare reading the Father, not only confutes, but exposes this poor Evasion: He is about to explain this Form, and first saith, *Christ gave us a Form of Prayer* — and explains himself presently thus — *ut dum prece & oratione quam filius docuit apud patrem Loquimur, facilius audiamur.* Where we see the Form, is those very words which Christ taught, and which we speak to his Father; and *Mr. S. B.* fallaciously leaves out [*loquimur*] the main word in the Sentence, importing our repeating the very words, on purpose to impose upon his Reader — *S. Cyprian* adds — *This is the most spiritual and true Prayer, which was pronounced by his mouth* — for when Christ's Prayer ascends to Gods ears, the Father will own the Sons words — He saith also, *When we ask forgiveness we pronounce the words of our Advocate, and not only ask in his Name, but by his own Prayer.* Can any man now doubt that *Forma orandi*, here signifies the words of our Lords Prayer? or deny *Cyprian's* commending the use of that Form? Let us apply the aforesaid passages to his Notion of Directions and Instructions, and see how ridiculous it will appear; *Do we speak or say over Christ's directions about the manner of praying to the Father, that we may be heard more easily?* are those Instructions, *that spiritual and true Prayer pronounced by Christ's mouth?* are they Christ's prayer which ascends to his Fathers ears, and are owned by him as his Sons words when we pray? is our following his Instructions asking forgiveness in his own words, and by his own Prayer? Alas! to what absurdities hath his Resolution, to defend an ill cause, reduced him! 'Tis true, *S. Cyprian* digresseth a little (as *Tertulian* had done) to explain the directions which our Lord gave about the manner of praying; but he soon returns to the Form it self, repeating it *verbatim*; and as he explains every single Petition, affirming, that *the Christians said so and so in their Prayers.* And it is clear from him, that they both used this

this Prayer, and others formed by this pattern; wherefore *alter orare, praying otherwise* (in *S.Cyprian*) which he so severely censures, cannot be designed to condemn those Churches who framed other Forms by this pattern, and always used this Form for one, as our Church hath done; it is levelled at those who either wholly omit the Lords Prayer, or in their arbitrary Compositions take no care to suit them to this Heavenly pattern, of both which some Dissenters are guilty: He concludes with observing, that I noted *Origen's* phrase of *using Prayers*, imported, they were composed by others; and he wonders what I would note upon *Cyprian's* phrase of *making Prayers*: And I have a Note upon that which will not please him, *viz.* That *S.Cyprian* saith, a Man makes his Prayer, when he uses the very words of the Lords Prayer, the Form of Christ's making: And if *Mr.S.B.* would infer from hence, That they prayed extempore or arbitrarily, he cannot draw that conclusion from *S.Cyprian*, where he that prays by a Form, is said *precem facere, to make a Prayer*: So that *using Prayers* in *Origen*, plainly supposes them made before-hand; but *making Prayers*, here, do not at all suppose them to be Extempore, nor can they infer that from the words of *S. Paul* who would *have prayers, &c. to be made for all men*, *1 Tim. ii. 1.*

Page 44. I brought that passage in *S.Cyprian*, *Publica est nobis, & communis oratio*, to prove, that the Congregation vocally joyned with the Priest in prayers, which doth suppose a Set Form. *Mr. S. B.* saith, *Common-prayer* signifies no more, than that *we must pray for all People*. Now *S. Cyprian* indeed doth make this one sense of *Common-prayer*, as appears by the words he cites; but then the Father goes on to shew, that the Lords Prayer (for it is of that he speaks) is a *Common-prayer*, because it is said, as that of the Three Children was, *Who* (saith he) *all agreed in their prayer, in voices as well as in hearts, and sung their Hymn as it were with one mouth*—— (note here the meaning of that phrase) *And so* (saith he) *did the Apostles, who are said to pray with one accord*. Thus far *S.Cyprian*. *Mr. S.B.* wholly omits this sense of a *Common-prayer*, and which is worse, denies that this is any meaning of it: But let it be considered, that the people then vocally repeated the Lords Prayer (the *Common-prayer* here spoken of) and let it be remembered what I said

said about *word &c.* upon pag. 20. and then I hope it will be granted this is one sense of a *Common-prayer*, that is, a *Form in which Priest and People may vocally joyn*. Yea, this seems the only sense in the second Quotation which I cited, *Cypr. ad Cler. & Pleb. ep. 8. We must pray for all—as the Lord taught there where he enjoined, not every one a single Prayer, but commanded us to pray for all men with a Common-prayer in which all agree*. For here S. Cyprian saith, *The Lords Prayer was a Prayer for all Men*; and then adds, *it was a Common-prayer*. Now this would be a tautology, If the only sense of a *Common-prayer*, were a *Prayer for all Men*; this had been as if he had said, *We must pray for all men, in a Prayer for all men*; if that were all, S. Cyprian might have left out *Orare pro omnibus*, or *communi prece*; but his using both these phrases shews not only, that the subject of the Lords Prayer was general for all men; but the way of using it, was by the peoples joyning with the Priest, and reciting it in common. And if S. Cyprian believed Christ taught us to pray thus by vocal joyning in one common Form, then they who will have the Minister alone make all the prayers Extempore, while the people silently sit by and hear, teach another manner of praying than Christ taught.

Pag. 45. The Preface, *Lift up your hearts*, with the Response, *We lift them up unto the Lord*, in *Cypr. deorat. §. 22*. I still take to be a firm proof of the use of alternate Forms in the public Service, and think it probable, he cited them out of the Liturgy: A Versicle and Response is an alternate Form, and S. Cyprian mentions it, as a thing known and daily used in public. The Centuriators infer hence, *That there were Forms in his time*; and Goulartius (a learned Protestant) in his Notes on the place, *Owens it was a Form used of old at the Eucharist, where it continued to be used in S. Augustin's days*; Goular. not. in *Cypr. p. 322*. I might produce innumerable eminent Authors, who are of the same Opinion; but Mr. S. B. saith, *He is not to enquire into the Inferences which others make from this place, yea, he threatens me with Reflections, for my observing them*: Which minds me of that Saying of old Fabius, related by S. Hierom, *ad Pammach. ep. 26. It were happy for Arts, if none but Arriests might judge of them*. However, his Reflections could not have hurt me in so good Company; if he had vented them, they must have returned

ON

on his own head, for he that despises such Evidence, brings both his learning and modesty into question. Again, he retires to his old Fallacy, *That I should first have proved there was then a Liturgy, before I had supposed this passage was cited out of it.* I hope I have proved this to every body but Mr. S. B. who will not allow any proof to be the first, and by that politick Supposition, hopes to persuade such as take his word, there can be no second proof; but whatever become of my former Evidence in his Opinion, I am sure there was one in this place which he could not answer, viz. *That this very Preface in so many words, is found in all Liturgies of the African, Eastern, and Western Churches.* To which I add now, that S. Aug. saith, *All Mankind as with one voice used these words; de ver. Rel. c. 3.* And the Liturgies wherein these words are prescribed, must be elder than S. Cyprian's time; for S. Aug. believed this Form came from the Apostolical Age. S. Cyril (who explained this Form in S. James's Liturgy, not above 70 year (according to S. Hieron) after Cyprian's time) tells us so early, that he had this and other mystical Forms, from the Tradition of his Fathers. The Author of the Constitutions (who writ, as I have shewed in the middle of the next Century) hath also this Preface in the Eucharistical Office, which was so old then, that it challenged an Apostolical Original. And since the Form was so ancient, and not only in these Churches, but in those which followed the Liturgies of S. Basil and S. Chrysostom; and in the West, the same words were used, it is evident the Form must be so very old, that none presumed to alter it: Let Mr. S. B. (before he despise this Evidence) give an instance of some Extempore or arbitrary Prayer or Exhortation, wherein so many distant Churches did so universally, or could so exactly agree; till then his Harangues about a possibility of exhorting or praying in various words, is nothing to the purpose: Nor is his Objection material, *that Cyprian doth not speak of it as being used in the Eucharist*: For he speaks of it as used so oft as the Priest and people met at solemn Prayer, that is, daily; and he saith, s. 13. that they then received the Eucharist every day; wherefore this Preface was used daily in the Eucharist, where all the Liturgies, and where all the Fathers, Cyril, Ambrose, Augustin, Chrysostom, &c. expressly say it was used; yea, S. Chrysostom reckons it up as one eminent part of the Liturgy, in Coloss. hom. 3. Tom. 4. pag. 106.

So that this Preface (which also gives name to the Lauds that follow it) was a part of the Communion Office in Form, as early at least as S. Cyprian's time, and we have proved the Lords Prayer was so also, which is a good step toward a prescribed Liturgy, both these being always and invariably used.

Page 46. The next Quotation, was not produced for a more evident proof of Liturgies than the Preface, *Lift up your hearts, &c.* (as he suggests) but to shew the agreement of the *African* and *Greek* Churches, in another Form, *Give holy things to the holy.* The Examiner alters the main word on which my Observation was grounded, and cites this place, *Sanctum quoque jubeamur, &c.* but my Edition [*Colular. Genev. 1593.*] reads it, *Sanctum quotidie jubeamur, &c.* which implies, there was a daily charge given to the Christians (who then daily received the Eucharist) to give holy things only to the holy: And S. Cyprian doth not cite the Gospel (*Math. vii. 6.*) for the charge it self; but only he shews, it was grounded on that piece of the Gospel, *Give not that which is holy to the Dogs:* And I hope Mr. S. B. doth not think this piece of the Gospel was every day read to them; therefore S. Cyprian refers to a daily charge in the Eucharistical Office in *Africa*, and there being the same charge found in all the ancient Eastern Liturgies (as I shewed) it shews an agreement between the *Greek* and *African* Offices, which was the only thing to be proved, and which proves Forms used in both these ancient Churches.

Page 47. Again, I did not pretend to find a Christian Litany in the same Tract, but the general heads of one, the words of which (as I noted) they concealed from Pagans; but the resemblance between *Tertullian's* and *Cyprian's* heads, and those in the Litanies, whose Original is so ancient, we cannot positively assign it: This (I say) is at least a probable proof they were then in *Litanick* Forms, especially if with S. Chrysostom we believe these Forms were made at first by Inspired persons, preserved by some and imitated by following Ages, with no more variation than must be occasioned by the difference of time and distance of places. I grant, this is but probable Evidence; but in these early times we must be content with such; and though Mr. S. B. can see no strength in this way of arguing for Liturgies, yet he discerns a mighty strength in Mr. CP's most remote Conjectures for extempore Prayer. So he doth in that of Cyprian's Epistle to P. Lucius, wherein there

there is an account, that they at *Carthage* prayed for Pope *Lucius* in his banishment, and this in *their Prayers and Sacrifices*; whence Mr. *Cl.* infers, *they were at liberty to put up any occasional Petition in the Eucharist, and so could not be confined to a set Form.* The weakness of which Inference I shewed, by observing, 1st, That these are not the Petitions put up for us by *Lucius*, but the general purport of them described in a Letter. 2^{ly}, That a constant liberty for inferior Ministers in this Age when Inspiration is ceased (which is that Mr. *Cl.* would have) can by no means follow from the Chief Primate of *Africa's* making a new Petition or two, in the times while Inspiration continued. 3^{dly}, Nor a daily liberty in ordinary cases, be inferred from some variety on so extraordinary occasion, as the exile of the chief Patriarch of the West: For if one of the most eminent Bishops at Liberty in the late Reign, had put up one or two new Petitions for his Seven Brethren in the Tower, none could infer from thence, that all our Clergy were always at liberty to pray in what words they pleased. As to Mr. *Cl.*'s Note, That if this had been the *African* Form for Confessors, *Cyprian* need not have told *Lucius* of it: I replied, The distance between *Rome* and *Africa* was so great, that *Lucius* might probably be ignorant of that Churches Forms; but however this Letter is rather to acquaint *Lucius* they did pray for him, than to give him an account of the very words. Mr. *S.B.* saith very little to all this; but with respect to my 2^d Answer, he scoffingly reflects upon my supposing, a Primate had more liberty than an inferior Clergy-man, as if this liberty were to be exercised only by such as could climb up to the top of Ecclesiastical Dignity, and not in proportion to mens Gift. To which I shall only say, That though there be some such as Mr. *S.B.* who have extraordinary Abilities, and are not advanced (according to their merit) to be Governors of the Church; the public Peace requires these Persons to forbear exercising these Abilities, unless their Superiors command them; for even in the very Apostles Age God himself ordered the Spirit of the Prophets, to be subject to the Prophets, to prevent confusion in the Churches of the Saints, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33. The like proof for Extempore Prayer, is that out of *Cypr. epist. ad Mos. & Max.* which is only the general account *Cyprian* gives these Confessors in a Letter of prayers made for them; but there is no intimation the Petitions

were Extempore: So that they must either refer to the common Form for Confessors, or some Form made by this great Pimate on this great occasion; but a daily liberty for the inferior Priests to vary then, doth not follow from this place; and if all the Priests in *Cyprian's* Diocess had made their own Forms for *Moses* and *Maximus*, or had daily prayed for them in various phrases, it had been impossible for *Cyprian* to pretend to set down in a Letter, what was the substance of those many various prayers: So that whether it were the old Form, or a new one (such as our Bishops make and send us on extraordinary occasions) it was a Form, and that sufficiently confutes *Mr. Cl.* and secures the point in question. Indeed *Mr. Cl.* had not cited this place at large in his *Disc. of Lit. pag. 68.* and I thought he had referred to the beginning of that Epistle, where *S. Cyprian* desires the prayers of *Moses* and *Maximus*; but *Mr. S. B.* hath obliged me by citing the true place at large, by which I perceive I was mistaken before; and I shall freely own it, wishing he may follow my Example so oft as I convince him he was in an Error, and then our Controversie will soon be at end; and he may see by this Reply now, that it was more difficult for me to find *Mr. Cl.'s* Quotation than to answer it.

Pag. 50. Instead of repeating *Mr. S. B.'s* partial account of the dispute between *Mr. Cl.* and me, about the liberty the ancients took to alter Christs own Form of Baptizing, I shall refer the Reader to my *Hist. Lit. par. 2. pag. 247.* where that matter is fully considered, and all *Mr. Cl.'s* pretended Evidence disproved. As to the last place out of *Cypr. ep. 73. ad Jub.* Both *Mr. Cl.* and *Mr. S. B.* cite it falsely and fraudulently: *Mr. Cl.* hath it, *Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt* — *modo in nomine Jesu Christi, &c.* *Mr. S. B.* adds nothing but these words — *foris extra Ecclesiam* — But the true reading (in *Pamelius*, in a later *Paris* Edition, in *Goulartius* and the *Oxford* Edition) is, *Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt, foris extra Ecclesiam, imo contra Ecclesiam, modo in nomine Jesu Christi, &c.* So that *Mr. Cl.* leaves out all; and *Mr. S. B.* half the Character of those persons, who said Baptism was valid if it were administred only, in the Name of Jesus Christ; they were such as were out of the Church, and against the Church, that is, Schismaticks and Hereticks. Which being evident, I beg the liberty to examine, First, Whether it were not fraudulent in both my Adversaries to omit the Character of those men, by whose opinion and practice they would prove

prove an usage of the Church? 2ly, Whether they might not as well prove the antiquity and lawfulness of Extempore Prayers, from the notions and practice of *Montanus* and the *Messalians*? 3ly, Whether they believe the present Church is obliged now to follow their Examples, who were out of the ancient Church, and Enemies to it? When Mr. S. B. hath considered well of these Questions, I hope he will be satisfied that this place doth not prove, that the true Church then took liberty to vary Christs Form, nor can any thing be inferred from it, to justify the granting such liberty now.

§ 4. Pag. 51. That clear instance of a Liturgy left to them of *Naocasarea*, by *Greg. Thaumaturgus*, from which for a long time after they would not vary in a Ceremony, a word, or a mystical Form, looks so like a proof of Forms invariably used, that Mr. S. B. labours by all means to evade it; and, 1st, He pretends this passage of not varying, &c. relates only to Doctrins. 2dly, He saith, *S. Basil mentions not Gregory's appointing a Form of Prayer for that Church*. Both which I shall disprove: For first this passage cannot refer to Gregory's Doctrins (any further than that must be supposed agreeable to the Forms of Worship he left behind him) because the things they would not vary from, nor add to, were *Actions*, *Words*, and *Mystical Forms*. 'Tis true, if [*ἀόρα*] had stood single (as it doth *Ep. 75.*) it might have been applied to *Doctrins*; but what *Actions* or *Mystical Forms* are there in Articles of Faith? these can relate to nothing but Divine Worship. Again, *S. Basil saith, Many things [ἅ τὰ αὐτῶν πνεύματα] in their Administrations were now become defective by the antiquity of their Institution*; and yet they would not vary from them. Now let Mr. S. B. consider, whether Gregory could institute any new Orthodox Doctrins? or whether true Doctrins can ever become defective by their antiquity? and then he must confess this Answer was a meer shuffle to cover a bad Cause; *Doctrins can be instituted by none but Christ and his Apostles*, and are the better for being old; but a *Liturgy* is capable of growing obsolete, and it is that of which *S. Basil* here evidently and undeniably speaks, which answers his second Objection: For though he do not use the very words, *Liturgy*, or *Form of Prayer*, yet he mentions *Administrations*, and declares they would not add to them [*ἐν τῇ Πράξει τοῦ ἁγίου ἔστιν ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιτίθεται οὐδὲν πρὸς τὴν παλαιάν*]

not

not an *Action*, a *Word*, nor a *mystical Form*: These are the main parts of a Liturgy, which consists of Rubrics for Ceremonies, the words of ordinary Prayers and Praises, and the mystical Forms of Administ'ring the Holy Sacraments. Now if they added nothing in any of these particulars to the Administ'rations he left them, doubtless they made no new Extempore Prayers, nor varied at any time; therefore they confined themselves invariably to what he had prescribed them, in Ceremonies, Words, and mystical Forms; and these words of S. Basil evidently suppose, he left them a Liturgy consisting of all these particulars prescribed. Besides, *τύπον ὡς ἔστιν* (had it stood alone) signifies a *Form for the Mysteries*, so very clearly, that it would suffice to have proved the Sacraments were administ'ed by such a prescribed Form. When S. Luke writes down the very words of a Letter, he saith, it contained *τύπον ὅτιον*, Acts xxiii. 25. so Nazianzen (S. Basil's Friend) calls Divine Offices [*ταπρημῶς τύποι ἐκκλησίας*] the prescribed Forms of the Church, which were preserved; and Julian imitated these by making [*ἔχων τύπον*] a Form of Prayers; Naz. orat. 3. p. 101, 102. Cedrenus, in the Life of the Emperor Zeno, calls the Imperial Edict sent to Alexandria [*τύπον*] a Form: And Zonaras informs us, that the Fathers assembled in the Council of Trullo, call the Emperors Edicts [*ἀνωτάτους τύπους*] the public, or political Forms; Can. 38. vid. Beveridge. Concil. Tom. I. p. 201, 202. In the Euchologion, the Priest is directed to do all things as he is directed [*ὑποὺς τῶν τύπων*] in the Formularies; Euch. p. 11. And the learned Dr. Duport, in his Greek Version of our Common-prayer, useth *τύπος* in his Title-page, and elsewhere, for our prescribed invariable Forms, of Ordination, of Administ'ring the Communion, of solemnizing Matrimony, &c. So that if these Authors understood Greek, *τύπον ὡς ἔστιν* signifies a prescribed Form for the Sacrament; and S. Basil implies they had such an one, and would not make a new one, to be added to their Liturgy. But further, Mr. S. B. doth in effect grant they had such a Liturgy; for he conceives (p. 52.) they strictly kept to that way and method for their ordinary worship, and administ'ring the Sacraments which were in use in Gregories time; and he owns, That S. Basil is here proving three words of his Doxology (viz. with the Holy Spirit) by that which Gregory taught them. Therefore that which S. Basil refers to, must be something more than an arbitrary way and method, it must be something fixed and invariable,

riable, the words of which, as well as the method, had never been altered since *Gregory's* time, otherwise he could never have proved three words by appealing to this way of Administration which *Gregory* left them. It was also a part of public Worship, he would prove Orthodox, viz. a *Doxology*; and *S. Basil* saith, *Gregory* and he had the same manner of *Doxology*, as any man who would enquire, might easily be satisfied out of the Traditions kept in that Church. *Bas. de Sp. Sanct. cap. 29. p. 221*. So that, in that Church there were some known Traditions, which preserved the very Form and words of *Gregory's* *Doxology*, to which he appeals; and no doubt these Traditions were written Records, because they might so easily be found upon search, and 'tis probable he means they were preserved in their Liturgy: And 'tis certain, he could never have appealed thus, if at *Naocæsarea*, they had only kept *Gregory's* method in their Administration, but varied the words every day. *Mr. S. B's* last refuge, is to make *S. Basil* contradict himself in another place of his Works, where he saith, *He gives a very different account of these Naocæsareans (viz. in his 63. Ep.)* for when they objected the difference between his way of Singing and *Gregories*, he asks them, *By what testimonies they will make this difference evident, since they had preserved nothing of Gregory's until that time.* But first, it will not easily be believed that *Mr. S. B.* expounds *S. Basil* aright, when he makes one place of his Works directly contradict another; *Mr. S. B.* will sooner be suspected of a misrepresentation, than this excellent Father of a contradiction. And 2dly, These two places may fairly be reconciled: The former Quotation [*lib. de Sp. Sanct.*] refers to a whole Liturgy; the latter [*Ep. 63.*] relates only the different manner of Singing, which consisting chiefly in sounds, could not properly be set down in any Rubric, but must be conveyed by constant and invariable practice down from *Gregory's* Age; their Rubric might direct the use of the Psalms, but not the particular manner of singing them. If they alledge, *They sung them now exactly, as their Forefathers did in Gregory's time*; he asks, *How they can prove a practical thing (wherein their Rubric was silent) to be the same it was so many years before?* Doubtless no way, but by making it appear they had varied from *Gregory's* practice in nothing; and here *S. Basil* takes occasion to mind them (who were so zealous for their way of singing) in how much greater matters of Piety and Morality

rality

rality, they had varied from *Gregory's* practice: For he used reverent gestures in prayer; he would not Swear, nor call his Brother Fool, &c. and these are things enjoined by Holy Scripture: And while nothing of *Gregory's* Manners (in these considerable Instances) was to be found among them, it was unreasonable in them to contend with him for a mode of singing (not determined it seems in *Gregory's* Liturgy, and so) only to be proved by their fancy, that it was in use in *Gregory's* days. So that by this Rhetorical phrase, that *nothing of Gregory's was preserved*, *S. Basil* did not mean, *nothing of his Doctrine*, nor of *his Liturgy*; but of his *Usages* and *Manners* in the greatest and best things, viz. his *Practices*, grounded on Holy Scripture; and since the *Manner of Singing* was a practice also, their failing in greater matters made it very suspicious, they had varied in that which was less. As for *Mr. S. B's* Objection, That *S. Basil* cites not *Gregory's* Rubric or Liturgy, but Scripture for these Observances; it is easily answered, because those acts of Piety and Morality are not the proper Subject for a Rubric, but are expressly enjoined in Gods Word; and that makes his Argument the stronger, and their tenaciousness the more unreasonable. For *S. Basil* at most differed from *S. Gregory* but in a supposed rite or mode of Singing; but they differed from that holy Bishop in material duties, positively required by Holy Scripture; and till they corrected these Variations in their practices, it was very undecent for them to quarrel at him for a slighter difference. And now I hope I have rescued this holy Father from the pretended contradiction, and sufficiently proved there was a Liturgy left by *Gregory*, and invariably used till *S. Basil's* time.

§. 5. *Pag. 55.* From the prescribed Hymns writ at least as early as the beginning of this Century, and rejected by *Paulus Samosatenus* (mentioned by *Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 24.*) it is certain they used Forms of Praise in their public Worship, and from parity of Reason I argued the probability of their praying by Forms also. *Mr. S. B.* instead of giving a solid Reason (as he hath often been desired) why they might not pray to God, as well as praise him by Forms: 1st, Pretends *he is not sensible this way of arguing is cogent.* But I think that Argument to which he can give no solid Answer, and which puts him into a fit of Railing,
is

is very cogent: For, 2^{dly}, He rudely falls upon my Character and Qualifications, and exposes me for conceiving my *Tautologies to be graceful Flights*. I might in return to this enquire into his Qualifications for that Office he once assumed, of going about with the vile Regulators of Corporations, in the last Reign, to procure the choice of such Members as would take away the Penal Laws and Test, and level the way for Popery to come in under the mask of Toleration. But I will be content to vindicate my self, and must tell him, I have so much skill both in Liturgies and Singing, that I know Hymns, Psalms, and Praises are a large and essential part of all Liturgies, and so mixed with Prayers, that it is impossible to separate them; and I am so far from knowing any difference between Praying and Singing, that I can sing a Petition as well as a Thanksgiving; and so can Mr. S.B's Friends at their Meetings, where they sing Psalms of Prayer as well as Praise. The *Lutheran* Protestants sing all their Prayers, some of our Anthems also are Collects, and we have musical Notes adapted to the Litany, as well as to the *Te Deum*: We read many of our Praises, and sing some of our Prayers. And many of the Dissenting Pastors use such variety of Tone in their Prayer, that if it did not want regularity it might be called Singing; and if a skilful man heard their inartificial Modulation and odd Cadencies, he would think they did not scruple singing their Prayers, but chose to do it with Discord rather than Harmony. But still it appears, that Singing is one way of performing the duty of Prayer among all sorts of Christians, and he can find no more difference between singing and praying, than between singing and saying a Prayer; that is one way of praying, and singing is another; only we may sing a Form, according to art, but an Extempore Prayer cannot be sang harmoniously.

§. 6. Pag. 56. My last Instance in this Period was to shew, *That the People used the Form of saying, Amen, upon receiving the Eucharist*. Now this matter of Fact is undeniably true: I proved it before out of *Justin M.* and *Tertullian*; and here *Eusebius* confirms it by the Epistle of *Dionysius, B. of Alexandria* (which should have been figured thus; *Lib. 7. cap. 8. pag. 188.*) and my Examiner makes the same thing plain from an Epistle of *Cornelius B. of Rome*, re-

corded also by *Eusebius*: wherefore, since so many distant Churches did so exactly agree in the use of this Response at the very time of Receiving; no doubt it was enjoined by some prescribed Rule (grounded at first upon that of *S. Paul*, *How shall he—say Amen, at thy Eucharist*, 1 *Cor. xiv. 16.*) For had it been arbitrary, it would have been varied, and neither the same word, nor the same time of saying it, could have been found in different Churches and distant Ages: The consequence of which is, that there were prescribed Forms directing a certain Response in one certain part of the Service, for the People. *Mr. S. B.* passes by this Inference very wisely, and pretends I went about to prove here, That the Form of Administring the Sacrament was prescribed: Now this can be nothing but a wilful mistake, because I said expressly, *This was a Form in which all Christians agreed at one certain time and place*: But the Christian People never repeated the words of Administration: That Form indeed is very ancient, grounded on Scripture, and alluded to by both these Authors; but I was not speaking of the Form of Administration, but of the universal Custom of saying *Amen*, just when they received; which clears the use of prescribed Forms.

§. 7. Pag. 59. I shall conclude with a brief review of the Particulars, whereby I have made out either the ancient use of a Liturgy in general, or of the several parts of it. 1st, *The Prayers delivered from their Fore-fathers*, in *Josephus*; the word *Liturgy* in *Clemens Romanus* and *Hippolitus*; the *One Prayer allowed by the Bishop*, in *Ignatius*; the *Common-prayers*, in *Justin M.* *The Prayers made as with one common Voice*, in *Ch. Alexandrinus*; *The solemn Rites and praying by Memory*, in *Tertullian*; the *Christians using Prescribed or enjoined Prayers and Forms taken out of the Psalms*, in *Origen*; *The Public and Common-Prayer*, in *Cyprian*: And that *Liturgy* left by *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, used without adding or altering a word, for an hundred years after; do prove a Liturgy in general: And, 2dly, for the parts of it, I have proved the *Hymns were prescribed Forms, sung alternately*, by *Philo, Pliny, Ignatius*, and so very many others, that I am censured for Tautology; The *Gloria Patria*, I have shewed to be as ancient as *Irenaeus* and *Tertullian*; The *Litany* is plainly alluded to by *Justin M. Tertullian*, and *S. Cyprian*; There is a *Collect* in Form clearly proved from *Origen*; The *Lords*

Lords Prayer was repeated by all the People in public, in the time of *Tertullian* and *S. Cyprian*, who also hath *the Preface and Responses used at the Eucharist, in a Form*; the answering *Amen* at the Receiving, is a Form in *Justin M. Tertullian*, and many others; and *S. Cyprian* shews, they did not vary Christs Form of Baptizing. Now these Proofs in a dark Age (wherein there were few Writers, and those only accidentally and cautiously mention these things) are sufficient to shew, that Forms of Prayer and Praise are very ancient, chosen as the best way of serving God in public, even when many did not need them (because divers were Inspired.) Now if this pure and early Age, had, and used Forms invariably, then a settled Church after Inspiration is ceased, who imitates their Example, and uses Forms, because she believes them ancient and lawful; and enjoyns them strictly, because she needs them and finds them expedient; doubtless she doth well, and they who can find nothing sinful in the Forms, but refuse to Communicate with the Church, merely because she uses and enjoyns Forms; these not only *were wont to be called Dissenters*, (as *Mr. S. B.* flatters them) but ought now to be called *Dissenters* and *Schismaticks* also, being guilty of an inexcusable Separation.

As to his Conclusion, he first owns *the Lawfulness of Liturgies*, but is afraid, I design to make them thought *necessary*; and it seems that made him labour so much to baffle my Proofs of them from *the Three first Centuries*: Upon which I must assure him, that I do not think every thing to be *necessary*, which I can prove to have been used in the first Three Centuries; I think Liturgies ten times more necessary now than they were then, and my Proofs in this Period were chiefly designed to shew the Lawfulness and Antiquity of Forms in public Worship; but that which makes the use of them necessary to us, is the Churches Authority: He adds, *Their Lawfulness may be argued from more rational Topicks than human Authority; their Expediency must be judged upon a just weighing of Circumstances; their Necessity cannot be proved by any Topick.* I reply, *Mr. Clarkson* forced me to argue for Liturgies from human Authority, because he first denied them to be Ancient; and I hope, if he argued falsely from that Topic, I might argue truly; especially since I urged also Scripture and other Topics in that History, which *Mr. S. B.* hath not answered.

answered. 2dly, As to their Expediency, the Church (the proper Judge of that) hath already upon weighty Reasons determined that point; and I see no Reason why Mr. S. B. should desire to have this weighed over again, unless he hope to hold the Scales. The Church hath proved their Expediency many and many times, and over and again confuted all the Dissenters Objections; and I considered this Point, as oft as Mr. Cl. gave me occasion, as he will see when he hath read my whole Book. For the necessity of Liturgies; that follows, from their being expedient, and as such enjoyed by the Church: For an ancient Lawful expedient way of public Worship enjoyed by lawful Authority, becomes necessary: And if there were any Men in the Communion of this Church, who call one another, *Judicious, Learned, and Moderate*, and yet are so intent upon altering our Foundations, as to count my defending the Established Way of Worship, *The managing a Design against them*, it would be more necessary than ever to keep close to our Ancient Way of Worship. But I hope this is only a Dream of Mr. S. B.'s, and believe there is really *never a learned, judicious, moderate Man in our Communion, but himself*, who thinks, I had any design against them in writing my History of Liturgies. As for Mr. S. B. he hath too visibly declared his averſation to the Establishment to make me value his Censure; his Friend Mr. Cl. could pick up but two Phrases, which he perverted, (as I shewed) and that was all the Grey-Beard he had to fasten to the Juvenile Chin of Extempore praying, (without extraordinary Inspiration) yet Mr. S. B. admires and defends him. I have brought many Phrases, and justified my exposition of them, so that he durst not attack them; besides some express proofs: Yet all this is despised in his scurrilous Conclusion; which is so clear a discovery of the Man, and the Party he favours, that till he come to examine more closely, and judge more indifferently; till he perform more and brag less, I will neither trouble the world nor my self with any further Reply to him; being assured, that by this loose way of writing, he will neither do my Cause any harm, nor his any good, among those that are truly learned, moderate and judicious, of what Communion soever they be.

F I N I S.

